

GOVERNMENT OF WEST BENGAL  
Uttarpara Jaikrishna Public Library

Accn. No.....5442.....

Date.....24.12.74.....

*call*  
Shelf List No.....052.BRI.R

Vol. 21 (XLIII)











THE

# BRITISH REVIEW,

AND

LONDON CRITICAL JOURNAL.

---

“—FIAT JUSTITIA.—”

---

VOL. XXIII.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR L. B. SEELEY AND SON,

FLEET STREET

---

MDCCLXXIV.



Uthmaniyah Library  
Acq. No. 5446 Date 24.12.77  
052 BR11R  
Vol. 23 (XLVII) THE



# BRITISH REVIEW,

AND LONDON CRITICAL JOURNAL.

FEBRUARY, 1825.

185  
18

*The Library Companion ; or, The Young Man's Guide, and The Old Man's Comfort, in the choice of a Library.* By the Rev. T. F. Dibdin, F.R.S.A.S. London. Harding & Co. 1824. Pp. xxviii. and 912.

"THE present is peculiarly the age of bibliopolistic adventure and enterprize." Among the various channels which British capital, activity, and ingenuity, have opened for the accumulation and diffusion of wealth, few are more wonderful than those connected with literature, in all its varied departments, considered simply as an article of trade. The means of intellectual improvement are so prodigiously extended and so minutely ramified, as to embrace every class and, comparatively, every individual of the community: and the degree in which this unlimited spread of knowledge augments the resources and grandeur of the country is proportionably great. Profound indeed would be the surprise of bibliopolists of "the olden time," could they burst the cearments in which they are quietly inhumed; walk into the repositories of their successors, in the mighty mazes of London, and survey the piles of literature with which the shelves of these magnificent establishments are one day groaning, and which are, the next, distributed, as by some magical agency, to the four winds of heaven. The astonishment with which Aladdin beheld the interminable riches of the cave whither the magician had conducted him; the surprise of a Highland crone

NO. XLVII.

upon contrasting her simple distaff with the machinery of a cotton factory, could hardly exceed the overpowering wonder, with which the shades of these worthies would behold the issues and returns of modern publishers and dealers, "in number passing number." Mons. Dupin, whose good sense, comparative candour, and spirit of research are often in ludicrous opposition to the natural vanity of his country and to the fear of offending the Leviathans of its power, might have enlarged on this subject, to the advantage, although possibly to the mortification of those, who read the "*Voyages dans le Grande Bretagne*," on his side of the channel. The Great Nation, pleased as she is with herself, can pretend to no rivalry on this ground. In fact our literary enterprize is unparalleled either in the old or the new world. Other countries may assume the attitude of admiration; but every attempt to overtake must long be made "*haud passibus æquis*." Some curious and interesting statements in the preface to the work now before us, are calculated to impress us with sentiments of uncontrollable wonder at the scale upon which knowledge of every kind is imparted, and at the magnificent item which the processes of its distribution present in the national commerce, prosperity and grandeur.

Among the many remarkable circumstances connected with this universal spread of intellectual commodities, one is peculiarly calculated to arrest and impress the attention of all considerate minds. A total alteration in the character of reading provided for the lower classes of the community, is rapidly taking place, if indeed it be not already effected. Instead of the low, trifling, or licentious works, with which the fertile press formerly teemed, and which principally constituted the poison with which men's minds were corrupted, rather than the food with which they were fed and invigorated; the principles and experiments of mechanical and chymical science, the elements of mathematics and natural philosophy, the works of standard authors in divinity, poetry, and history, are published at prices so reduced, and in forms so commodious, as to render them, to a considerable extent, attainable by the industrious and frugal artisan, in these times of well-remunerated labour. The effects thus silently, but surely, resulting from such facilities for mental improvement in the more humble walks of society, cannot fail to exert a momentous influence upon the character and habits of our population. Within a very few years, knowledge of this kind was a sealed book to the great mass of the community; and was attainable only by those gifted few, whose buoyant and vigorous genius enabled them to burst through all the

restraints of poverty and labour; until they stepped forth from their obscurity, to astonish and instruct mankind. Scarcely any rank of life is now placed below the reach of knowledge, and the influence which it invariably imparts to its possessor. The commercial spirit of rivalry, which has lately been introduced among publishers, cannot fail to cherish any latent spark of genius, with fuel which the love of distinction, or knowledge, or money, may enkindle into a flame. And it is not perhaps too much to expect, from the operation of these causes, large reinforcements to the crowded ranks of practically scientific men, with which the country already abounds; and with whose increase, the continuance of its unequalled career in all the arts that gladden and embellish life is so inseparably identified.

To a near and attentive observer, however, the picture, which at the first glance looked bright, sunny, and beautiful, as a landscape of Both, or Cnyp, will appear to have some shades of dark and gloomy character. It may possibly admit a question, how far the unlocking these avenues to learning, and throwing open its gates so wide that all may enter and wander through its mazes as they list, will advance the religious and moral character of the community, and therefore its *real* prosperity and happiness. The very mention, indeed, of such a doubt, amidst the light and liberality of the nineteenth century, may subject us either to the expressive sneer of contempt, or to the loud and open condemnation of scorn and reproach. Such weapons, however, are like the javelin of Priam, "*imbelle telum sine ictu.*" They who aim, though humbly, to direct the public taste, and to raise or refine the tone of moral feeling through the land, are clad in that impenetrable panoply which virtuous intention always supplies. It is their duty to take heed, lest their eyes be dazzled with visions of good or glory, too frequently as unreal as they are magnificent: or lest they be led astray, by the loud voice of popular hope and anticipation, either to follow, or to lead, in the breathless chase after a perfectibility which may exist only in the ardour of unchastened imagination; while the good old paths of peace and contentedness are left at fearful distance. We have assuredly put in motion a machine of astonishing capability, by the impulse which has already been given to a love of knowledge throughout all ranks of the people; and of which the velocity is continually increasing. What cannot therefore be checked, should be at least directed: and in this duty the soundest judgment, as well as the most vigorous effort, should be used by every friend to public morals, private virtue, and

the general safety. If amidst this rapid and surprising extension of every kind of information, secular and economical, there be not a decided and unwearied effort to extend the knowledge and influence of a religious principle through the land, until by the divine blessing its agency shall be commensurate with every attempt at mental enlargement, it well befits us to inquire, whether the machine thus moved, and of which the enormous power is already felt through every part of the empire, may not produce a reaction and recoil of the most formidable momentum upon the peace and order of society. We are treading upon hazardous ground in making these remarks; and are hinting doubts of the most unwelcome and unpopular character. Feeling, however, that the lever of Archimedes is brought out for use; and persuaded that it needs only a fulcrum to move the world; we are anxious that its centre of motion should be the word of God, and the principles of that sound religion which is to be found, not in the cold maxims of philosophy—not in the airy visions of natural goodness and benevolence—not in the heartless theories of those who deride, as enthusiastic, all the peculiarities of our faith,—but in the pure and perfect gospel of Jesus Christ. We hardly know a greater benefit which a friend of religion and man, whose extensive knowledge is hallowed by that inspiration of the Almighty which giveth wisdom, could bestow upon the world, than a clear, dispassionate, and forcible estimate of the advantages arising from increasing knowledge,—the dangers by which it is accompanied,—and the best human means of extending the one, and counteracting the other. Such a man might not have the praise of brilliant discovery, nor take his envied stand among the greater masters of human intellect; but he would have a peace and consolation which the applause of the world could not give, nor its censure take away. His motto could not be, “*In tenui labor;*” for his object is of unequalled importance—an importance which may now be overlooked and despised, by the froward, the careless, or the irreligious; but which would have a present reward in the approbation of the wise, and of which the value will be fully understood and appreciated in the ultimate decision of the supreme Judge upon the condition of mankind.

These are, certainly, reflections more serious than the review of a work on bibliography might appear suited to produce: but they are *not remotely* connected with the subject; and are too important in their character to need that much apology should be made for them to those who look beyond means, and contemplate the end. While, however, the almost incon-

ceivable number of cheap and useful books is tending to produce a democratic tendency in literature; as the spread of commerce and wealth among the unprivileged orders tends towards the same result in the state, there are not wanting efforts of a very strenuous and decided character, in order to effect the important revolution of changing the republic of letters into an oligarchy, and locking up those stores of learning which should be the common property, in the cabinets of the wealthy, by affixing a fictitious, arbitrary, and enormous price to works which, except for such a combination, would be more generally attainable. By some indeed it is unequivocally avowed, "that any thing so brilliant, so exquisite, and so unrivalled, as book-rarities of the higher class, must not be expected to be laid open in broad glare to the unhallowed gaze of the multitude," even in the tantalizing form of a catalogue raisonnée. (Preface to Sir Egerton Brydges' *Restituta*, Vol. IV.) We have turned over, with cordial and eager delight, numerous pages of bibliographical lore. To some indeed, it may appear a dull and barren field of employment. To us, it has always been gay with flowers, and filled with fruit well adapted to our taste. We revel in possession of some of these gifted volumes; and linger in memory over the contents of others. The names of Horne, Ames, Dibdin, Herbert, Savage, Brydges, Haslewood, Park, "*cum multis aliis, quæ nunc perscribere longum est*," are "familiar to our ears as household words." Nor can we look upon the *Censura Literaria*, *Typographical Antiquities*, *Restituta*, *British Bibliographer*, *Typographical Antiquities*, *Bibliomania*, *Bibliographical Decameron*, *Bibliotheca Spenceriana*, and though last, not least, upon the opus magnum of Dr. Watts, without feelings of respect and gratitude to those who have thrown so much light upon the earlier and long neglected treasures of our national literature. They have (to change the metaphor) gone to the fountain, unsealed it for themselves, drunk deeply of its pleasant waters, and opened a channel by which the stream might, in some degree, reach and refresh the public mind.

But after all, they have only allowed us to receive a scanty rill, just sufficient to stimulate our thirst, but very inadequate to allay it, or to confer that vigour and elasticity of mind and imagination, which a free access to the spring could hardly fail of producing. Some of these treasures indeed have been partially distributed by judicious reprints, attended with biographical notices of the writers, whose very memoirs had often almost perished from the earth: and with such explanatory remarks, as bibliographical and black-letter lore can furnish.



Yet these very volumes, so rich in the notices of scarce, early, and valuable writers, are doled out with such a parsimony of impressions, and with so much charlatanerie of coloured paper, broad margins, private presses, delicious vellum, and all the ingeniously gorgeous devices of bibliopolistic mystification, as can serve no other end than to confine their pages more closely and exclusively within the libraries, not always of the studious, but of the opulent. We cordially rejoice indeed, at the numerous instances of men of rank and wealth, the counsellors of the nation, and the directors of its habits, who have good sense, good taste, and good feeling enough to appropriate large revenues to the attainment of these book gems, which will be their ornament, amusement, and solace; when less worthy, though more ordinary sources of expenditure, will yield only a hollow and momentary joy, to be afterwards repaid with the bitterness of self-reproach and regret. Still, out of this very honourable emulation among the highest classes of the state to abound in splendid books, we cannot close our eyes against the fact, that it regards the general interests of learning and knowledge, with an aspect rather prejudicial, than favourable. Authors, and the great body of the reading public, derive no real or material benefit from the excessive prices to which books are thus raised: because the value, whether real, arising from the cost of materials and skill, furnished by the engraver, the printer, and the bookbinder; or imaginary, proceeding from the will of the bookseller, is wholly independent of him who composed the work. The accompaniments of magnificent publications are undoubtedly highly honourable to the fine arts, which have attained such excellence in England: and that would be a mean and miserable policy which would banish or restrict them. We are only anxious that *some* copies might be attainable by scholars who might benefit by the work in its unembellished and humbler form.

It would be very easy to trace a close, intimate, and perhaps necessary connexion, between every new work on bibliography, and a material advance upon the prime articles of all forthcoming catalogues from the stores of our most eminent booksellers. Competition is unquestionably promoted; but it is almost purely a competition of traffic, without material tendency to diffuse knowledge; nay, rather, with an increasing tendency to confine it within more narrow limits. It is vain to assert, as a triumphant reply to the objection, that the number of orders for rare and valuable books is greatly multiplied. The question still remains to be answered, whether, if the best books were printed and bound upon a

scale of moderate expence, the number of copies sold would not materially increase. We cordially acquiesce in a deep feeling of respect for the conduct of publishers in general. Contrasted with their habits and modes of dealing a century ago, it appears most honourable to them, and most useful to the public. Our sentiments on this point are in strict accord with those of Dr. Johnson; and we are fully persuaded, that an author's best patron is a liberal and enlightened bookseller. We have noticed some customs of trade, which might be "more honoured in the breach than the observance;" not with any wish to diminish the well-earned profits of publishers, but because the prevailing system appears materially to cripple the spread of knowledge among a large class of men,—whose education and habits have led them to study; who are zealous for the interests of literature; but whose "*res angustæ domi*" effectually prevents them from the accumulation of stores which would be within their reach, if they were given to the world in a manner less costly, and upon terms less arbitrary. Why is not some publisher and editor found who will come forward, and give us access to those stores which the enlarged study of bibliography has discovered, in plain unobtrusive forms, and upon terms of easy attainment. A copious and judicious selection of British Poets, with all the delightful additions which now might be made to it, would be an era in the history of our literature; and the parties undertaking it would remove a reproach which has long gathered over the character of England, that of being less mindful than they ought of the poetical renown, for which she is without a rival among the nations of the earth. Such men would be indeed the benefactors of their times; and would establish an imperishable claim to the gratitude—not perhaps of the thorough-paced bibliomaniac—but of a very large and influential class of the community—even of those men who form the base and shaft of the literary column, if they attain not the ornament and elevation of its Corinthian capital. And why should the most rabid bibliomaniac hesitate to open his stores for a purpose so truly generous? The Transfiguration of Raphael would lose nothing of its value, were copies multiplied by the hand of Haydon, or transferred to paper in numberless impressions from the burin of Finden, or upon the steel plates of Heath. Nor would the possessor of the Pigot Diamond (as it has been well observed) value his jewel less, if it had been modelled in glass, and sold by every lapidary in London. If the stores thus collected in the recesses of the curious were precious as the Sybil's books, they should perhaps, on that very account, be

multiplied, and the prototypes would lose nothing of the high esteem in which they ought to be held. The magnificent collections abounding throughout the country have conferred a benefit hardly to be appreciated, by rescuing from utter destruction many unique works, of which the loss could never be supplied. That kindness however being done, another of equal importance would be communicated, by imparting them to the common need.

These remarks have been suggested, and as we think naturally, by Mr. Dibdin's new publication, "The Library Companion;" a publication which we venture to predict, will have more influence than any of its predecessors, in advancing the price of books of comparative rarity or more than ordinary splendour. Bibliography is perhaps more indebted to this gentleman than to any of its living cultivators. His labours have served to introduce a new and splendid era in book-decoration: and his works, considering their elaborate character, and the enormous extent of reading which they involve, are produced with a rapidity truly astonishing. Such is the exuberance of his stores, such the extent and variety of his attainments, such the accurate method of his arrangement, and such the facility of communicating that knowledge of which he is so unrivalled a master, that we stand amazed at the beautiful and voluminous results of his labour. The pencil of Mr. Lewis has shed an almost magical effect upon the graphic illustrations of Mr. Dibdin's pages. His drawings are distinguished by an accuracy, truth, and spirit highly admirable; and which irresistibly assure us that the mind and hand by which they were imagined and traced, possess requisites for the highest excellence in this enchanting walk of art. The burin of the engraver has not been wanting; and it is impossible to turn over the leaves of the Bibliographical Tour, without sentiments of very high respect for the combination of excellencies which they so largely exhibit. The volume before us is of more humble pretensions, and aspires to no pre-eminence as a work of art, beyond the praise of good though certainly not of correct printing. The notes indeed, contain more typographical errors than are usually met with in works of this class and character, and than we should probably have expected from one whom custom must have trained to detect, an error, however minute, with no common quickness of observation.

Greatly as England at this day abounds with men deeply versed in bibliographical science, and initiated into the dim and awful mysteries of Roxburghe lore, Mr. Dibdin is con-

fessedly the Hierophant of the sect; and to him, in an especial manner, did the reading and collecting public (for they are by no means convertible terms) naturally look for some vade mecum to the best editions of the best authors in various departments of literature and science, foreign and domestic. His acquaintance with the treasures of learning, whether the more usual or recondite, has been gathered, not merely from the perusal of booksellers' catalogues, or extracts or anas, but from a long, ardent, enthusiastic inspection of the best libraries, at home, and on the continent of Europe. He has revelled in the wonderful collections of Spencer, Cavendish, and Heber; men whose zeal in the cause of Bibliography is only equalled by the unstinted liberality with which their almost unimaginable store of literary wealth is laid open to the use of inquiring scholars.

Their volumes, open as their heart,  
Delight, amusement, science, art,  
To every ear and eye, impart;  
Yet who, of all who thus employ,  
Can like the owners' selves enjoy?

Few of the valuable editions of the best, or even the worst authors, whether *rari*, *rariores*, *rarissimi*, or *unique*, have failed to pass through the hands of this most accomplished book-antiquary. He always speaks with the fervour, not of a man relating what he has heard, but, of one who gives his account of volumes, '*oculis subjecta fidelibus*,' in an extent of numbers, and with a minute accuracy of examination which challenge unqualified wonder. A great master of moral philosophy once observed, that the human stomach had a surprising power of endurance. He is said to have been a personal and practical illustration of his own remark. It is at least equally astonishing how much literary food, and that of the most discordant character, these *Helluones librorum* can retain and digest. Mr. Dibdin is unquestionably at the head of this distinguished body, of which it is quite difficult to say whether we most admire the *quantity* they consume, and the extent of their assimilating powers, or the squeamishness of appetite that must be whetted, with morocco leather of every hue, with semi-fawn or orange calf, with black-letter vellum gems of Caxton or de Worde, with rich gilt borders, and edges, and tooling of every variety, and with all the other arcana of bibliopegestic craft from the hands of that most cunning artist, C. Lewis. All recent attempts to give collectors a guide to the best books, and the best editions, from Mr. Kett's very imperfect "*Elements of General Knowledge*," to the present time, had only served

to shew the necessity of the task undertaken by Mr. Dibdin; and to the fulfilment of which, it must have been a mere affectation of modesty to have professed himself unequal. We rejoiced therefore in the announcement of his work; waited as patiently as we might for its appearance; and received it from our bookseller with a feeling of pleasure familiar to Mr. Dibdin upon the possession of some bijou which he had long rather wished, than expected, to find and transfer to his own shelves. We had little doubt but that a great desideratum in literature had now been supplied; and that the learned and indefatigable author, like the profound and eloquent Barrow, had exhausted, (if exhaustion were not impossible) the subject on which he had written. We have read the volume curiously, like men who sip their wine, and hold it in the light to judge of its colour and flavour, before they drink the glass. We have also examined it, carefully as befits the importance and difficulty of the subject; and the result of our acquaintance with it, which we offer with sincere respect for Mr. Dibdin, is a mingled feeling of pleasure and disappointment. The main divisions of the work, with their subordinate ramifications, exhibit a masterly simplicity of classification. The text, and notes, (which a little reminded us of a celebrated comparison made by a certain northern review, between Dr. Parr's wig, and Spital sermon,) exhibit a very luminous and minute view of standard works, in the different walks of learning: and the whole collectively exhibit a mass of information more vast and varied, than perhaps has ever been laid before the public on this very interesting subject. It is worthy of the reputation which Mr. Dibdin has already earned, and will add another leaf to the antiquarian laurels, another ray to the splendid and glittering nimbus by which his head has been long adorned. Very fairly may he address his readers, in the language of that master-bard, with whose verse he is not less intimately acquainted, than with the editions in which it has delighted the world,

Vive, vale. Si quid novisti rectius istis,  
Candidus imperti; si non his utere mecum.

This challenge he may safely make. He may confidently throw down his gauntlet in the wide arena of book mystery, without fear that any champion will be found hardy enough to step forth, and take it up, to his defiance. In this walk, he is the very Jupiter of the literary Olympus

Unde nil majus generatur ipso,  
Nec viget quicquam simile aut secundum.

Whence then, it will be asked, can any feeling of disappointment arise upon the perusal of such a work? Whence can proceed any diminution of that gratitude which its author seems justly to claim? May he not address us once more in the language of Horace, and say,

Quod petis, hic est,

Est Ulubris, animus si te non deficit æquus.

We will hazard a few remarks upon the manner in which Mr. Dibdin has accomplished his purpose; and commit them to his own candour, not less than to that of the many individuals by whom his work will be read and studied: in full persuasion, that they will be made in a spirit which he will not condemn; even though his judgment should dissent from the propriety of their application.

The volume is arranged under the following principal heads,—Divinity, History, Voyages and Travels, Biography, Philology and Belles Lettres, and Poetry including the Drama. It will be easily imagined, that the subdivisions of this classification, (which could hardly be more brief and simple) are extremely numerous. They are sometimes perhaps separated from each other "*exiguïs finibus*:" but it is extremely difficult to draw any determinate line in such cases. These minor divisions will almost necessarily run into each other like shades of the same colour. A very complete synoptical table of subjects and authors is prefixed to the work: and the whole is closed by a copious index of books, persons, and things. If the entire execution had been answerable to the model upon which the learned author wrought, "it had been vain to blame, and useless to praise him." We have rambled with him through the almost interminable mazes of notes and sub-notes, replete with every variety of literary gossip, as well as recondite research; and our journey has been, "*nec solum non molesta, sed etiam jucunda; neque nobis hunc errorem quo delectamur extorqueri volumus.*" Viewing the book however, as meant for general advantage, we are compelled to descend from the bibliographical hobby, on which we have often ambled with so much delight; and to say, that a brief catalogue raisonnée of the best authors and most choice editions in each department of knowledge, with the probable prices of each, would have been more extensively useful. Such a book might indeed have been made, comprehending perhaps a very brief estimate of each writer, something in the manner of that most attractive author, Grainger; and the most solid and serviceable information would thus have been conveyed without the infliction of a book too extensive and lengthy.

In such a work the demands of the inveterate Bibliomaniac ought less to have been consulted, than the advantage of those very numerous readers who are debarred from the purchase of rarer gems, but would gladly know where the best *attainable* editions of the authors they admire may be found, and upon what terms. The notes too, we must add, however great the mass of information contained in them, are not unfrequently desultory and unsatisfactory.

From the vast accumulation of Mr. Dibdin's stores, we can easily imagine the ease with which he could have poured a flood of anecdote upon his readers. But however reasonably expected, and delightful in the Bibliographical Decameron, Tour, or Typographical Antiquities, this would serve only to enlarge such a book as the present, and distract the attention of its readers. We can well understand the difficulty of withstanding the temptation to insert them; a difficulty occasionally insuperable, and which evidently strives for mastery with the author's sense of duty, in almost every part and page of his highly desultory, and yet highly instructive work. A literary anecdote is to him like a quibble to Shakespeare; "its fascinations are irresistible. He follows it at all adventures; it frequently leads him out of the way; and *sometimes* engulphs him in the mire. It is the golden apple for which he will always turn aside from his career, or stoop from his elevation." These little episodes are not sparingly scattered through the book: and we shall present our readers with one or two specimens.—

"There is one point of view in which the advantage of a work of this nature may be noticed, however slightly; especially as, in the present instance, it may be illustrated by an example of no mean authority. From the several departments of a volume of this kind, the reader may *select* what will be useful for the several objects of his pursuit: what is fitting for his town, and what for his country residence: what should be the light troops, as it were, to attend him on a journey: and what the heavier or *household* troops, to remain at head quarters. I have alluded to 'an example of no mean authority,' as confirmative of the advantage of such a plan. That example is his *late Majesty* George III. who could not only boast of the finest private library (of his own collecting) in Europe, but who was himself no inconsiderable bibliographer. In the year 1795, when his Majesty was about to visit Weymouth—and wished to have what he called 'a closet library,' for a watering place—he wrote to his bookseller for the following works. The list was written by him from memory; and I will fairly put it to the well-read bibliographer and philologist, whether it be capable of much improvement? It is as follows—copied from the original document in the *King's own hand writing* :

- The Holy Bible, 2 vols. 8vo. Cambridge.  
 New Whole Duty of Man, 8vo.  
 The Annual Register, 25 vols. 8vo.  
 The History of England, by Rapin, 21 vols. 8vo. 1757.  
 Elémens de l'Histoire de France, par Millot, 3 vols. 12mo. 1770.  
 Siecle de Louis XIV. par Voltaire, 12mo.  
 ——— XV. par Voltaire, 12mo.  
 Commentaries on the Laws of England, by William Blackstone, 4 vols.  
 8vo. newest edition.  
 The Justice of Peace, and Parish Officer, by R. Burn, 4 vols. 8vo.  
 An Abridgement of Samuel Johnson's Dictionary, 2 vols. 8vo.  
 Dictionnaire François et Anglois, par M. A. Boyer, 8vo.  
 The Works of the English Poets, by Sam. Johnson, 68 vols. 12mo.  
 A Collection of Poems, by Dodsley, Pearch, and Mendez, 11 v. 12mo.  
 A Select Collection of Poems, by J. Nichols, 8 vols. 12mo.  
 Shakespeare's Plays, by Steevens.  
 Œuvres de Destouches, 5 vols. 12mo.  
 The Works of Sir William Temple, 4 vols. 8vo.  
 The Miscellaneous Works of Addison, 4 vols. 8vo.  
 The Works of Jonathan Swift, 24 vols. 12mo." (Preface, pp.vii. viii.)

" For a century (from 1500 to 1600) there was nothing in Italy—at Venice, at Florence, at Milan, or at Rome—like the wealth of the Fuggers, at Augsbourg. The cause of their wealth arose from the possession of the quicksilver mines of Almaden, in Spain, the produce of which was necessary in order to work the mines of Potosi. They became so rich, in consequence, that it was thought they possessed the philosopher's stone. Rabelais says, that, after the Fuggers, at Augsbourg, Philip Strozzi was the richest merchant in Christendom. An anecdote is recorded of their wealth, that, on Charles the Fifth's passing through Augsbourg, on his expedition against Tunis, he found a faggot of cinnamon placed (by their order) in his chimney, which was lighted by the promissory note of Charles, to repay them a large sum of money which he had borrowed of them. There was a neatness, a delicacy, a magnificence, in this mode of proceeding which could not be surpassed. Some blundering bibliographers (says the *Biog. Univ.* vol. xvi. p. 154.) have classed the *Fuggerarum Imagines* among botanical works, under the '*Resemblance of FERNS.*'" p.495.

" Mezerai died in 1683, in his 73d year. Never was a man more singular, or fuller of bizarrerie, than this extraordinary man. His countenance, figure, and dress, were almost equally repulsive. He was once stopped as a vagabond, by the overseers of the parish, and commanded to follow them. So far from being displeased at this adventure, it amused him, and he entered into the joke exceedingly. 'Gentleman (said he) I cannot well accompany you on foot, but, as soon as they have put a wheel to my carriage, I'll accompany you wherever you please.' One of his oddities was, to work by candle-light, even in the middle of the day, and in the midst of the summer; and he always attended his visitors to the street door, on parting,—holding the lighted candle in his hand. Strolling through the small



village of Chapelle, in the way to St. Denis, along with some of his friends, they all stopped at a public-house, of which the master's name was Le Faucheur. Mezerai saw in this man what none of his friends could perceive, and took a violent fancy to him. He used to go and spend whole days with him: and, in his future habits of study, it was observable that a well-replenished bottle, as well as a lighted candle, was by the side of him. He concluded his intimacy with his bacchanalian friend, by making him his residuary legatee, to the great mortification of his relations. Mezerai was extremely susceptible of cold. His friend Patru met him one morning, when it was freezing very hard, and asked him, 'how he found himself?' 'I must run away from you immediately, (replied the historian,) for I am at L.'

"This enigmatical reply was explained to Patru. Mezerai kept behind his arm chair, immediately on the setting in of winter, a dozen pair of stockings, ticketted from A to M. On getting out of bed he always consulted his barometer—and according to the greater or less degree of cold, put on so many more, or fewer, pair of stockings. Thus, he had on *eleven* pair when he met his friend Patru." (Pp. 291, 292.)

"There can scarcely be a reader in England, Scotland, or Ireland, but what through the medium of Reviews and Magazines, has had *some* acquaintance with the MEMOIRS of the amiable and accomplished EVELYN: apparently, the ornament of every circle, and the object of general applause, during the latter part of the seventeenth century. He was at *least* the Sir Joseph Banks of his times. I have before\* had occasion to notice his intimacy with the leading families of rank, which appears little, if at all, to have spoilt his natural frankness of manner, and sincerity of character—but for these 'MEMOIRS' which have lately furnished such a source of amusement, and such a general theme of praise, singular to remark, posterity is indebted for them to an accident—the relation of which will afford one of the most AMUSING ANECDOTES of literary history. It is here given on authority which cannot be questioned.

"At the beginning of April, 1813, Mr. William Upcott (author of the most valuable bibliographical work extant on *British Topography*) went to Wotton, in Surrey, the residence of the EVELYN FAMILY, for the first time, accompanied by Mr. Bray, the highly-respected author of the *History of Surrey*, and acknowledged editor of John Evelyn's Memoirs, for the purpose of arranging and making a catalogue of the library, which had been thrown into much confusion by its removal for safety, in consequence of accidental fire in an outbuilding. Early in the following year (1814) the task was completed. Sitting one evening after dinner with Lady Evelyn and her intimate friend Mrs. Molineux, Mr. Upcott's attention was attracted to a tippet, being made of feathers, on which Lady Evelyn was employed. 'We have all of us our hobbies, I perceive, my Lady,' said Mr. Upcott—'Very true,' rejoined her ladyship. 'And pray what may *yours* be?' 'Mine, Madam, from a very early age, began by collecting provincial cop-

\* *Fides Althorpianæ.* (Vol. I. p. xlv.)

per tokens—and 'latterly, the *handwriting* (or autographs of men who have distinguished themselves in every walk of life—'*Handwritings*!' answered Lady E. with much surprise; 'what do you mean by *handwritings*? surely you don't mean OLD LETTERS?' at the same time opening the drawer of her work-table, and taking out a small parcel of papers, some of which had been just used by Mrs. Molineux, as patterns for articles of dress. The sight of this packet (though of no literary importance, yet containing letters written by eminent characters of the seventeenth century, more particularly one from the celebrated *Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough*,) afforded the greatest pleasure to Mr. U. who took occasion to express his exceeding delight in looking them over. 'Oh,' added Lady Evelyn, 'if you care for papers like *these*, you shall have plenty; for SYLVIA EVELYN (the familiar appellation applied to John Evelyn by his descendants) and those who succeeded him, preserved all their letters. Then, ringing for her confidential attendant, 'Here,' said her Ladyship, 'Mr. Upcott tells me that he is fond of collecting old letters:—take the key of the *Ebony Cabinet* in the Billiard Room, procure a basket, and bring down some of the bundles.' Mr. Upcott accompanied the attendant, and having brought a quantity of these letters into the dining room, passed one of the most agreeable evenings imaginable, in examining the contents of each packet: with the assurance, from Lady Evelyn, that he was welcome to lay aside any that might add to his own collection. The following evening, the delicious *Ebony Cabinet* was visited a second time, when Evelyn's '*Kalendarium*,' as he entitled it, or diary, a small 4to volume, without covers, very closely written with his own hand, presented itself." (Pp. 550, 551, 552, 553.)

The first of these anecdotes is so illustrative of the character of George III. as a well-informed English gentleman—a praise long and malignantly denied him, but now awarded him by the honest and well-won suffrages of all intelligent men,—that we could not resist the desire to insert it.

We cannot sympathise with Mr. Dibdin in his anticipation of the objection that may be made, from the apparent vanity of frequent references to his own publications. Independently of his unanswerable position, that an author has a right to make use of his own property as he thinks proper—a position, by the by, which has been occasionally pushed to an extremity, we know that "one who has devoted so many years to the study, and published so many works on the subject of Bibliography, would find it barely possible to avoid noticing rare, curious, and valuable books which had not been already described by him with more or less minuteness in previous labours." Few indeed are the instances where he had it in his power to direct the reader to a *more* copious or accurate detail than his own: and the more expensive works which he has published may safely be quoted; because "The Library Companion" will fall into the hands of hundreds

who may have no access to his other works : and those who possess them will rejoice to be referred again and again to pages which always invite examination from their mechanical excellence and intellectual superiority. "Indocti discant, ament meminisse periti."

If we were disposed to find fault with Mr. Dibdin's style, its epigrammatic character would afford us no rare opportunities of being cynical. He is too fond of straining after prettinesses, and sharp modes of conveying his meaning. It does not content him to be dignified and lucid ; he must be brilliant and sparkling. There is a constant effort to be witty, and often to be droll. The light and airy postures, however, which he so frequently assumes, are neither in character with the subject, nor apparently with his own peculiar habit of thought. He is not formed to be thus vivacious ; and we know few instances in which an author has made more decided efforts to be jocose and merry with so little success as our author in this, and his preceding publications. The whole book, and indeed all that he has written, bear strong marks of great conversational powers, and of a capacity for successful inroad into the regions of social merriment of a highly intellectual order : but it evaporates upon paper, and too frequently leaves a residuum more dull than could be desired. If we were called upon to particularize, we would notice, as an instance, Mr. D's. pleasantry upon *Old Tom Fuller*. Old Tom Fuller ! Surely there is a sacredness about the piety, the talents, the learning, the simplicity of long numbered with the mighty dead, of one whose works are still the delight of every liberal student ; and whose very quaintness helps to give a magic effect to the wit and humour of his page. Fuller had laboured and suffered for the truth ; he was the steady zealous champion of the Church of England ; a man of almost unrivalled memory ; and "who has left enough to convince us, that he would have been admitted as a legitimate wit in any age : a man who had all the rich imagery of Bishop Hall, but with more familiarity and less elegance." Such men challenge the unqualified respect and veneration of all times and all countries, and all writers ; they are "inter delicias humani generis : " and when we see them exhibited as the buffoons, rather than as the instructors, of modern days and authors ; the smile which such a display was meant to evoke, is overshadowed by a feeling of regret for the injury thus committed, and of pain for him whose love of point could condescend to such an act of forgetfulness or inconsideration.

We are, however, obliged to make a more serious charge than the preceding against Mr. Dibdin ; which, if established,

must very materially detract from his qualifications to compile "A Library Companion." We think him by no means *an impartial writer*; and we proceed to give evidence in support of an opinion expressed with much unwillingness. Divinity, including the almost endless subjects of biblical labour, prayer books, old English divines, sermons, ecclesiastical history, and manuals of devotion, is comprized in 122 pages; while poetry and the drama occupy 212. When the relative importance of the two subjects is taken in connexion with the space occupied by each, we shall readily imagine, that they are hardly treated as might have been expected. But this is not all. Mr. Dibdin's paramount dread of the "sour and crabbed spirit of puritanism," and his instinctive abhorrence of Calvinism and enthusiasm, have led him to make many omissions of those divines who are generally considered to speak the sentiments of above two thousand ministers within the pale of the established church, yielding to none in high veneration for her doctrine and discipline, nor in the fervour of their aspirations that she may long continue a name and a praise in the earth. It will scarcely be imagined that while the biblical labours of Doctors D'Oyley and Mant are prominently brought forward, as capable of

"satisfying abundantly both the anxious and enlightened reader;" (P. 36.)

and while the bible of Bp. Wilson is highly commended, the commentary of Scott, in six volumes quarto, is passed over entirely, sub silentio. The work might have challenged Mr. Dibdin's notice and admiration, if only as incomparably the most remarkable specimen of stereotype printing that has been executed in England. It has, however, merits of a higher class: and its sale has been unprecedently great. Nearly 40,000 copies have been dispersed throughout America; and in England 5000 have been struck off and sold, since the plates of the present edition were completed in 1822. Scott has now assumed his place as an able and judicious expounder of the word of God: and while he stood in need of no recommendation, even from Mr. Dibdin's pen, he seemed entitled to regard from the extent of his popularity. Such writers confer distinction upon the pages where they are noticed, while they can derive none from any commendation however flattering. Scott will continue to diffuse that best knowledge which maketh wise unto salvation, and will be honoured as the lasting benefactor of thousands, when all the glittering volumes to which bibliography has given birth, shall be remembered no more. Again, among the ecclesiastical historians, we look in vain for the respected name of the pious and learned

Milner—a man who, feeling that his master's church was not of this world, left the secular path in which other writers had trodden, and gave a history of the spiritual character of that church through all various ages of its existence, down to the commencement of the reformation. At this period the subject was taken up by the late gifted Dean of Carlisle, who has placed the character of Luther in a point of view more calculated to do him honourable justice, than any former writer. We cordially unite with many of the sentiments and principles, so forcibly expressed by the immortal Warburton in his "Alliance between Church and State;" but we cannot be induced to overlook the merit and excellency of an author, who thought he should render a service to the interests of sacred literature, (and who has indeed been its benefactor,) by estimating the prosperity or decay of the Christian Church, simply by the extent or diminution of real piety among its confessors, governors, and members. An author on bibliography, who comes forward to assist us in the choice of a library, should cater for all appetites, and consult all inclinations, not immoral, whatever may be the peculiar bias of his own. He should surely take as his motto, "*Tros Tyrinsve mihi nullo discrimine agetur.*" From this rule, as we have seen, Mr. Dibdin has widely departed: and the undue partiality has afforded us equal surprise and regret.

Mr. Dibdin has occasionally, although perhaps as sparingly as could be expected, indulged himself in quotations from authors whose works are noticed in his pages. To such extracts he must have been continually tempted; but they serve little other purpose than to tantalize the reader; and rarely give him any useful insight into the character of the volume whence they are taken. Those upon which Mr. Dibdin has ventured, might have been spared, without any detriment to his work—and with the manifest advantage of brevity. We shall, however, objectors as we are, be pardoned for availing ourselves of one of these excerpts. It is from the martyr Barnes, and will be found in his "Articles condemned for Heresie." The concluding sentence, as Mr. Dibdin, with true protestant feeling, observes, "is glorious."

"The Bishop of London, that was then called TUNSTALL, after my departure out of prison, said unto a substantial man, that I was not dead (for I dare say his conscience did not reckon me such an heretic that I would have killed myself, as the voice went; but yet would he have done it gladly of his charity) but I was (said he) in Amsterdam; where I had never been in my life (as God knoweth, for yet in the country this 10 years)—and certain men did there speak with me (said he)—and he fained certain words that they should say

to me, and I to them; and added thereunto, that my Lord Cardinal [Wolsey] would have me again, or it should cost him a great sum of money—how much I do not clearly remember, I have marvel that my Lord is not ashamed, thus shamefully, and thus lordly, to lye, although he might do it by authority. And when my Lord Cardinal and he would spend so much money to have me again, I have great marvel of it. What can they make of me? I am a simple poor wretch, and worth no man's money in the world (saving theirs)—not the tenth penny that they will give for me. And to burn me, or to destroy me, cannot so greatly profit them, for when I am dead, the sun and the moon, the stars and the elements, water and fire, yea, and also stones, shall defend this cause against them, rather than *THE VERITY SHOULD PERISH!*" (p. 215.)

In this place we must also venture to extract the somewhat lengthy note upon mistakes in printing bibles, in which the name of Old Tom Fuller is so unhappily introduced. The evil is by no means cured: and amidst the thousands and tens of thousands of bibles that issue from the privileged presses of the land, it is wonderful that so many errors should still be allowed to deform the pages of the word of God. They are venial it is true, but they ought not to exist at all. The great advantage of that monopoly in printing the bible and prayer book, which we judge to be wisely given, is the power of preventing the occurrence of such errors, and the defence of Christians against the alteration of that volume which contains the charter of their hopes, and the law of their duties. In the same proportion in which mistakes are admitted and overlooked, that salutary restriction loses its effect, and lays a tax upon the community without repaying it an equivalent.

"In the old and not incurious library at Worthingham in Suffolk, (see p. 8. ante,) there is a very fine ruled copy, approaching to large paper, of Hayes's Bible, published at Cambridge in 1674. 2 vols. folio. On the fly leaf of it, is the following memorandum: 'N. B.—*This Bible belonged to K. Charles II. and [was] given by him to Duke Lauderdale and sold by Auction with the rest of his Books.*' In a comparatively modern hand, below, is written in pencil—

Hark ye, my Friends, that on this Bible look,  
Marvel not at the fairness of the Book;  
No soil of fingers, nor such ugly things,  
Expect to find, Sirs;—for *it was the King's.*

Old Tom Fuller, who published his 'Mist Contemplations on these times,' about the same year in which Field's great Bible appeared, thus notices the errors of many preceding impressions (above alluded to in the text) under the quaint title of

*'Fie for shame.'*

Considering with myself the causes of the growth and increase of impiety and profaneness in our land, amongst others this seemeth to me not the least, viz. the late many *false* and *erroneous* impressions

of the Bible. Now know, what is but *carelessness* in other books, is *impiety* in setting forth of the BIBLE. As Noah in all *unclean creatures* preserved but *two of a kind*, so among some *hundreds* in several editions we will insist only on two instances. In the Bible printed at London 1653, we read 1 Cor. vi. 9. 'Know ye not that the unrighteous shall inherit the kingdom of God?' for '*not inherit.*'

"Now when a Reverend Doctor in Divinity did mildly reprove some *libertines* for their licentious life, they did produce this text from the authority of this corrupt edition, in justification of their vicious and inordinate conversations.

"The next instance shall be in the Bible printed at London in quarto, (forbearing the name of the printer, because not done wilfully by him) in the singing Psalms, Psalm lxvii. 2.

'That all the Earth may know  
The way to worldly wealth,'—for '*godly* wealth.'

It is too probable, that too many have perused and practised this *erroneous impression*, namely such, who by plundering, oppression, cozening, force, and fraud, have in our age suddenly advanced [to] vast estate.'"

"Berriman, in his '*Critical Dissertation*,' upon 1 Timothy iii. 16, 1741, 8vo. pp. 52, 53: also notices several glaring and unpardonable blunders in the impressions of the Bible during the XVIIIth century: of which the chief are these. In a Bible printed in the reign of Charles I. the word *not* was left out in the seventh commandment. Selden, in his *Table Talk*, art. Bible, sect. xi. says 'a thousand copies' were printed with the omission of the '*not.*' And Heylin, in his *life of Laud*, Book III. p. 228, fixes it in the year 1632. 'His Majesty (Charles I.) being made acquainted with it, by the Bishop of London, order was given for calling the printers into the High Commission, where, upon evidence of the fact, the whole impression was called in, and the printers deeply fined, as they justly merited.' In this same reign, an edition of the Bible was printed in which the text ran (Psalm xiv. 1.) 'The fool hath said in his heart *THERE IS A GOD.*' Mr. Nye (in his defence of the canon of the New Testament) tells us, that, in consequence 'the printers were fined 3,000l. and all the copies were suppressed by the King's order.' If the fact be thus, the punishment seems to have been frightfully disproportionate: for the error might have been committed, through inadvertency, by the most respectable printers. The wonder is, even in this our day, not that errors very frequently occur (which they *do*) but that *more* errors are not discernible, considering the millions of Bibles which perhaps half a dozen years bring forth. It were well, however, if a little more attention were sometimes paid to the texts of our PRAYER BOOKS. The most careful clergyman may commit more than one error in the course of his perusal of some impressions; among which it pains a dutiful son of Alma Mater, to declare, that in an Oxford edition of the Liturgy, of 1813, 4to. the second line 'O Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the *world*,' is printed (at the end) 'the sins of the *Lord*:' a very gross, and scarcely venial fault." (Pp. 33—35.)

If we were asked to point out the parts of the book from which we have derived the most pleasure and advantage, we should fix upon the heads of 'History, Voyages, and Travels.' They are full, copious, and valuable. Bibliomania has not so frequently misled the author from his straight forward path; nor has he followed the exuberance of his own inclinations, so as to carry his readers and himself very far from the even tenor of their way. Instances of a contrary tendency however exist even here; witness the very lengthly notice of the collections by Theodore de Bry and Sofis, upon which the author luxuriates with no common delight; whets our appetite by every possible kind of excitement, through a succession of pages, and tells us at the same time, that a perfect copy is unattainable; and indeed neither visible nor tangible, save by the privileged eyes and hands of those few, those happy few, who have access to the library of The Right Hon. Thomas Grenville.

From the head, 'Philology and Belles Lettres,' we extract the following history of the *Olivet Cicero*, printed and published by the University of Oxford: principally because it tallies in a considerable degree with the fate of a large impression of the *Lexicon of Suidas*, put forth in the sister university; and of which so many copies were sold at a most inadequate price about twenty-four years ago.

"The *OLIVET CICERO* was reprinted at Oxford, in 1783, in ten quarto volumes; and the story attached to this reprint is whimsical enough. Though each volume contained 'Various Readings' from twenty-nine MSS. collated by Hearne, from several libraries in the University of Oxford, and from two MSS. in the library of York Cathedral recently collated—and though the tenth volume contained the useful 'Clavis Ernestiana,' and the whole had been long pronounced to be a handsome and useful edition—yet, strange to tell, nobody bought the book! Hundreds of copies covered, and nearly weighed down the shelves of the warehouse of the Clarendon Press; when at length, the signal was given that these books might be purchased at *thirty shillings* a copy: confining the purchase, as much as possible, to Members of the University of Oxford. Within "a little month," every copy put on wings and flew away. And now it is doubtful whether 5£ 5s. can procure one. But Mr. Parker, the leading bibliopole of Oxford, is as merciful as he is liberal." (P. 579.)

There appears to be a small mistake in the note relating to Baxter, at p. 50. He is represented, as "having had the honour to preach (*when young*) before Charles II. in the first year of his reign." Baxter was born November 12, 1615, and consequently in 1661, (the 1st of Charles 2d.) must have been forty-six years of age. Another slight error occurs at p. 63. in the note,



"If I were called upon," says Mr. Dibdin, "to mention six of the greatest works of our divines, each contained in one octavo volume, I should unhesitatingly pronounce the following, Butler's Analogy, Douglas's Criterion, Lowth's Prelections, Watson's Apology for the Bible, Paley's Natural Theology,\* and Prettyman's Refutation of Calvinism. I entreat the young collector, especially if he be destined for holy orders, to lose no opportunity of making himself thoroughly acquainted with the contents of these books. They are as snow white speckless and brilliant diamonds in the episcopal mitre."

Five of these learned and able men have worn the mitre: but it was never dignified by shading the brows of Paley.

Something like an Hibernicism appears to have escaped Mr. Dibdin in the following exclamation, at a sub-note, (p. 681.) referring to "the Balletys and Dyties salacious advised by Master Skelton, Laureat." "With what a *via lactea* of black-letter stars," exclaims our enraptured author, "is this gem incorporated!" A milky way of black letter stars is somewhat startling and incongruous. Perhaps, however, it was meant to be understood as a felicitous image—if so, we candidly confess, either that the idea is too nebulous to be fully apprehended; or that we are labouring under a degree of amblyopia, too severe to distinguish its lustre.

It will be perceived that no mention has been made of physical or mathematical works. The whole range of science and philosophy has been hitherto untrodden; and we rejoice to find that this omission, if it may be so called, is about to be supplied by a forthcoming volume. A new edition of the present work will doubtless be soon required: and some alterations must then be adopted, by which the supplements will be embodied under proper heads: and other improvements made which will easily suggest themselves to the consideration of the author.

May we be permitted, without offence, to ask, and with the most sincere admiration for the unequalled talents of Mr. Dibdin as a bibliographer, whether the quantum of time and labour bestowed upon the works by which he has established his high reputation; the constancy with which he must attend all the principal book-auctions, where he is much better known than even his predecessor, or rather, until a few years

\* If Paley's name be inserted in the select list, we think his fame will more safely rest upon the *Horæ Paulinæ*, than the *Natural Theology*. In the latter work he had been anticipated by Derham. In the former he is almost original: and this little volume is unrivalled as a body of evidence the most triumphant drawn from sources apparently the most trivial, and, a priori the most unpromising. Paley himself is said to have owned the *Natural Theology* to be a compilation; and, the state and application of the argument excepted, it derives its principal excellence from the lucid manner in which he has exhibited the knowledge supplied by others.

ago, his contemporary, "the milk white Gosset;" and the traffic in books which he seems to have kept up on a large scale, be exactly those employments in which the life of a minister of the gospel should be chiefly passed? We fear that such a question will at once rank us among

"The bigots of the iron time,  
Who call his harmless craft a crime."

But we know that a clergyman's ordination engagements require him to make all secular pursuits subordinate to the great work of preaching the gospel. We know also that St. Paul, upon whose authority, under the great Head of the church, that solemn service was compiled, has said in his address to Timothy, *Ev τέραις ἑσθι*—"give thyself wholly to them." The pursuit in which he has been long and ardently engaged, is one of a most engaging character. It is on that very account the more dangerous. It brings men into society and familiarity with the wealthy, the noble, and the wise. But if it take a minister of religion from the duties of his solemn office, or lead him in any degree to compromise them, he will find it difficult to answer the question which was once put to Elijah in Horeb, when he ought to have been engaged in reproving Ahab, "What doest thou here?"—or another equally poignant, "With whom hast thou left those few sheep in the wilderness?" We are very far from insinuating that Mr. Dibdin is at all negligent of his high obligations as a minister: but he is in a situation of some danger: And in times like the present, when the Ark of the Church which he loves is so rudely assailed, a clergyman of that church will surely be most near his post of duty while he is most immediately engaged in the solemnities of his calling; or while he at least makes every other employment subserve those hallowed interests which should be the paramount objects of his regard, "in season and out of season."

**ART. II.**—*Christian Theology ; or a connected View of the Scheme of Christianity*, in which the Facts and Statements of Scripture are examined, and the Doctrines and Inferences deducible from them illustrated and enforced. By the Rev. James Esdaile, Minister of the East Church Parish of Perth. Edinburgh : Waugh and Innes. 8vo. 1823. Pp. xii. and 461.

EVERY decade of the last three centuries has produced its own "Christian Theology," "Connected Views," and "Schemes," and "Systems," and "Elements," and "Principles," and "Bodies of Divinity," have been so multiplied, that we can scarcely take up a new book, with the old and familiar title, without a degree of reluctance. We peruse, and reperuse, and linger some moments over the title page before we venture into the volume. We venerate and love the sacred edifice of Christianity, and echo back one of its oracular voices : "One thing have I desired of the LORD, that will I seek after ; that I may dwell in the house of the LORD all the days of my life, to behold the beauty of the LORD, and to inquire in his temple." But when a new guide presents himself before us, with pretensions to information and talent superior to the many who have preceded him, and promising to point out to us beauties and harmonious proportions previously either unobserved or neglected, we for a time hesitate upon the threshold, and doubt whether or not we shall commit ourselves to his guidance. For there are not wanting those, whose dull and monotonous manner make the spectator yawn, even when surrounded by all the grand sublimity which over-awes, and all the exquisite beauty which enchants the soul. We have not this charge to bring against Mr. Esdaile. His style, with some few exceptions, is chaste ; and his method of exhibiting the most prominent and commanding particulars of his subject, is concise without being obscure, and lucid without being jejune and formal. We have read his performance with pleasure, if not with entire satisfaction. He thus simply and modestly avows his design in adding another to the many similar works already extant.

"My object in undertaking this work was, to render Theology accessible to the general reader ; and to present it to every inquiring mind, as a liberal and interesting, as well as a most important subject of investigation. They who are aware of the difficulty of making deep things clear, and intricate things plain, and disagreeable things interesting, will readily excuse occasional failures, if they can excuse the presumption of attempting such an enterprise.

"Though the work was written chiefly for the use of those who desire, or who need information, I am, nevertheless, not without hopes that it may furnish an interesting analysis of the divine economy, in the work of our redemption, even to those who do not need to be convinced of the truth of Christianity." (Preface, p. vii.)

Not attempting an analysis of this clear, and well arranged "Connected view of the scheme of Christianity," we shall rather lay before our readers such materials as may qualify them to form a judgment of its merits. In a work of this description we rather deprecate than desire novelty. If we meet with truth faithfully detailed, appropriately illustrated, and cogently defended, we are content. Our contentment advances into complacent satisfaction, when the detail of christian verities is luminous as well as faithful; when the illustrations rise above the level of trite common-place; and when the defence is maintained by arguments judiciously selected, forcibly stated, and urged in a temper of mind formed upon the hallowed model of that gospel, whose essence is love. Not that we advocate a tame and timid policy in contending for the faith once delivered unto the saints. A champion of that faith should encounter the sturdiest Goliath of the defying host on the vantage ground of revealed truth, and in the full confidence of ultimate victory. Infidels have secretly thanked the apologists and defenders of the christian system for descending to the level arena of sceptical argument, where human reason, without any competent assessor, is umpire of the conflict. We would ever have that ground maintained, which is taken by the Author whose work we are about to review.

"Religion is usually divided into Natural and Revealed; but it is easier to make the division than to fix the boundaries of each. The distinction, indeed, does not appear to be at all necessary; for it is obvious that the religion of nature, as it has been called, has no doctrines peculiar to itself, and none that it can challenge, as its own undisputed property. The existence of a God, and of a future state, providence, prayer, and public worship, are supposed to belong to the province of Natural Religion, because they can be established by reason, and because they have found a place where no revelation was known to exist. But all these articles of faith and of practice, lie at the very foundation of Revealed Religion; whose object is to explain them, in all their bearings and tendencies on the characters and hopes of men; whilst, in the course of this process, it brings to light many important facts and doctrines, which had eluded all the scrutinies of human reason.

"Revealed Religion, then, embraces all that is claimed for Natural Religion, and a great deal more; and whilst we are at no loss to point out doctrines peculiar to Revelation, we cannot point out a single

doctrine, which we can pronounce to be peculiar to Natural Religion." (Pp. 7, 8.)

Still, however, truth requires no asperity for its defence. Urbanity and persuasiveness are compatible with firmness and intrepidity, in maintaining a cause, on the issue of which man's everlasting weal or woe is suspended. On the defective powers of human reason, Mr. Esdaile observes,

"Although, then, I do not deny that the natural reason of man affords some light, yet it is evidently insufficient either for direction or consolation. It presents objects through an obscure medium, which so completely distorts and alters their real proportions, that, in many instances, it is little better than absolute darkness. Besides, whatever we may advance or admit as to the capacity of human reason for religious discoveries, rests entirely on theory and assumption; for in no one instance can we affirm that it has made a single discovery of this nature. All the religious systems in the heathen world, were evidently traditional; they are all connected with each other by some striking features of superstition, which are inventions and not discoveries, the figments of human fancy and not the offspring of reason; and whenever the heathens make any approach towards a rational creed, it will probably be nearer the truth to ascribe their knowledge to some borrowed light, derived from tradition or revelation, than to regard it as the result of their own investigations." (Pp. 11, 12.)

"The only inventions of human reason in matters of religion have been, to obscure what was plain, to mystify what was simple, and to degrade what was sublime, by unavailing attempts at explanation and refinement.

"It is not an easy matter, then, to define the limits of reason in religion. What it can do we can only conjecture, having no certainty that there is one article of the religious creeds which have been current among men that can be set down as the result of an unassisted reason. Were I inclined to preserve the distinction between Natural and Revealed Religion, I would not limit the former by attempting to draw a strict line of demarcation between it and the doctrines of Revelation: but I would consider, as within its province, all those doctrines which, whether they have been the result of reason or not, are, at least, cognizable by it, and capable of being established by its deductions, though they may not have been discovered by its researches. This is extending the boundaries of Natural Religion, without encroaching on Revelation: it is only giving reason the advantage of all the light which Revelation has imparted, and considering as within its legitimate province, those mature results which correspond with its dictates, though they may have originated in Revelation. Of this kind are the doctrines respecting God, providence, a future state, &c. which have been set in the clearest light by Revelation; yet our improved knowledge on these subjects is so perfectly conformable to the dictates of natural reason, that we can scarcely persuade ourselves but that reason, by its own efforts, might have reached them.

"The doctrines peculiar to revelation are of a different description,

and easily distinguishable from those mentioned above. The trinity, incarnation, atonement by Christ, resurrection of the body, &c. are doctrines not discoverable by reason. But we are not, on this account, to suppose, that they are not proper subjects of reasoning. They may be established by argument, by ascertaining the genuineness and authenticity of the records in which they are contained, and the value of the testimony on which they rest: and by considering, at the same time, the reflex light which they cast on the government of God, and on the character and condition of men. We are farther to consider, that, though the doctrines peculiar to Revelation could not be discovered by human reason, nor, even after they are known, can they be comprehended by the human faculties, yet in no instance do they contradict the dictates of enlightened reason: they are above it, but not contrary to it. It would be absolutely impossible to believe a revelation which contradicts any ascertained principle of pure reason. This may be considered as an axiom in theology: for a revelation must come from the same Being who has formed the mind of man, and the constitution of nature; and we cannot conceive that the word of God can ever contradict his works, or that he should command us to believe any doctrine which the reason he has given us compels us to reject. But, in admitting this axiom, we must be extremely careful to free reason from the influence of the passions, and from the power of those prejudices which tend to bias its decisions; otherwise we will measure doctrines and facts, not by the standard of reason, but by the strength of our inclinations and feelings. Revelation has certainly nothing to fear from the strictest scrutiny, provided it be fairly conducted; but it has no chance before a prejudiced judge, against perjured witnesses, and a corrupted jury." (Pp. 14—16.)

Our quotations on this introductory topic are already sufficiently long; but we cannot withhold our author's concluding remark on the distinction made between natural and revealed religion.

"There are, no doubt, some grounds for the distinction, if not in reality, at least in our conceptions, and in our manner of viewing the subject. But, I know not where the line is to be drawn: I am inclined to think, that if it is not an imaginary, it is at least a moveable boundary, which will gradually disappear as we advance in knowledge; and when, at last, 'we shall know even as we are known,' the most mysterious parts of the Christian revelation will be found to be as essentially connected with the nature and government of God, as his providence, or any of his most obvious attributes. It is no mark of wisdom to affect to despise the resources of human reason, and still less to slight the light of revelation, which alone can conduct our reason to just and profitable conclusions. Reason is the compass by which we steer our course, revelation is the polar star by which we correct its variations." (Pp. 18, 19.)

We were sorry to meet with any thing like vacillation respecting the origin and design of that vast scheme of propitiatory sacrifice, which on the testimony of all history,

sacred and profane, pervaded nearly the whole world, antecedently to the advent of Christ, and which, lamentable as were its abuses among the heathen, actually converted the earth into one stupendous altar, whereon beneath the temple of the surrounding heavens, mankind as with one voice and act avowed their sense of guilt, and their tenacious remembrance of the divine appointment of atonement for sin by guiltless blood. We do not say, that Mr. Esdaile has really conceded this point to those, who seem resolved never to yield to the accumulated evidence both divine and human which we possess, that "without shedding of blood, there is no remission:" but we conceive, that he would have done better for the cause of truth and for the instruction of his readers, had he withheld every thing in the shape of a hypothetical proposition on the subject. What tyro upon our classical forms would not expect a stroke of the ferula, or of another more formidable instrument, were he to construe, upon Socinian principles, the "*Ενθάδε μιν ταυροσί και αρνιοίς ιλαονται*" of Homer, and the "*Prudens placavi sanguine Divos*" of Horace? And, since a propitiatory efficacy was generally and universally ascribed by the heathen to their sacrificial institutions, then, if the axiom stands, that the cause must be adequate to the effect, the notion of a propitiatory atonement must have originated in a direct revelation from heaven. The stream was polluted in its onward course, but its fountain-head was divine.

The Holy Scriptures present a marked difference in themselves from all other professed depositories of religious doctrines. We have before us a mine, in which incalculable and inexhaustible wealth is deposited, but not so arranged as to spare the miner his toil and scrutiny. The sacred writers, although their premises are undeniable, and their conclusions legitimate, seldom appear in the character of argumentative and methodical reasoners. There is system, and there is harmony, in the word of God: but that system is not regularly defined, and that harmony is the harmony of nature, not of art.

"This (observes Mr. Esdaile) is exactly what might have been expected from teachers acting under a divine commission, and armed with undeniable facts to enforce their admonitions.

"But though there is no regular treatise in the Scriptures on any one branch of religious doctrine, yet all the materials of a regular system are there. The word of God contains the doctrines of religion in the same way as the system of nature contains the elements of physical science. In both cases, the doctrines are deduced from facts, which are not presented to us in any regular order, and which must be separated and classified before we can arrive at first principles, or attain to the certainty of knowledge; and in both cases, a consistent

system can only be made out by induction and investigation. The very circumstance of no detailed system being given, renders it necessary to form one: for although a portion of religious and physical knowledge, sufficient for the common purposes of life, may be obtained by traditional information, and men may work conveniently enough by rules without possessing much general knowledge: yet they who would teach with profit must generalize; and they who would explain the ways of God must arrange the materials which are so amply furnished, but which are presented apparently without order or plan.

"I would, therefore, consider all objections to systems of divinity to be about as unreasonable as it would be to object to the philosophy of Newton, for having elucidated the laws of nature and arranged the phenomena of the heavens." (Pp. 20—22.)

Now we are no enemies to "systems of divinity," as they are called, provided that their constructors retain and manifest the modesty and humility which become fallible men in all, their endeavours to arrange and systematize what God has left, at least in appearance, undefined. Some things are even now passing under our own eyes and in our own church, which emphatically warn us of the peril of placing divine revelation on the Procrustes' bed of human wisdom. We cannot say that the view of "Christian Theology" before us is wholly free from some of the objections, which, however unreasonable the author may deem them, are often with too fair a shew of justice brought against such systems. The humble, but independent inquirer after truth may derive from them important assistance; yet, after all his attempts at generalization and arrangement, he will sit down with the sentiment of the Patriarch on his mind: "Lo, these are parts of his ways: but how little a portion is heard of him."

Mr. Esdaile's classification and statement of the evidences demonstrative of the claims of Christianity, as containing things worthy of all acceptance, do credit to his abilities as a writer. If we find little originality, we meet with qualities of higher intrinsic worth, though of less external brilliancy. Of this, his application of Leslie's fourfold argument to prove the divine legation of Moses, and concerning which argument Dr. Middleton declared that he had been trying twenty years to find a flaw in it, but without success, affords a fair specimen. He evinces indeed throughout his volume a manly vigour of argument, highly becoming a reasoner who enjoys plenary assurance that he occupies ground not to be shaken; and who wisely deems it unnecessary, for the support of truth, that he should descend to break a lance with every petty assailant.

"The difficulties, then, which attend our conceptions of God, are



of evident advantage; as they tend to increase our veneration of the divine majesty; for it is not the intricacy, but the immensity of the subject which overwhelms us; we are not perplexed by obscurity, but, 'dazzled by excess of light;' and however far we proceed, we still see something vast and infinite before us. I do not reckon it necessary to enter into any formal refutation of the disgusting absurdities of atheism, which are almost universally rejected by the common sense, and the common feelings of mankind; insomuch, that I believe it would be easier to convince the world that Homer's *Iliad* arose out of a fortuitous concurrence of the letters of the alphabet, than that intelligence and design have been excluded from the formation of the universe. For here, the materials required not merely to be arranged, but to be created, and there neither was matter, nor motion, nor life, till the *fiat* of the Almighty gave them existence." (Pp. 55, 56.)

We have ever been accustomed to assign to the fall of man the full amount of penal consequences attributed to it in the word of God, and cognizable in the actual state of things: and contemplating these in connexion with the innumerable and self-evident proofs of divine care, benevolence, and love abounding upon and beneath the surface of a world, which, in righteous judgment, "the Lord hath cursed," we discover more conspicuous evidences of goodness and mercy, in the combination of alleviating comfort with penal woe in this province of the moral government of God, than we can conceive to be displayed in the whole remainder of conscious or intelligent existence. Admirable is the goodness, which at once imparts to the flitting insect the exulting gladness of its ephemeral being, and pours into the capacious spirit of "the rapt seraph that adores and burns" the full tide of celestial bliss: but it is only in the scheme of redemption that God says to every child of man, "I will make ALL my goodness to pass before thee."

The general manner in which the author has executed this part of his undertaking, is highly recommendatory of the volume at a season, when, to use the nervous language of a living writer, "it is evident that there exists such an active hostility against our common faith, as may well excite the counteraction of every man, who feels anxious as to the state of society into which his children are to grow up. From the pestiferous blasphemy of vulgar infidelity, up to the schools of science, and the library of female elegance, the mischief is at work. It adapts itself to all ranks. It has broad and rash assertions for the uneducated, theories of materialism for the scientific, flights of poetical sentiment for the fair, which, like Satan in Paradise,

Squat, like a toad, close at the ear of Eve.

It supplies pungent paragraphs to the weekly ebullitions of

anarchy,—it vapours in monthly criticisms,—and flashes amidst the quarterly coruscations of the Northern Lights. It affects antiquarian consequence, or grubs in the rubbish of chronology; or burrows among the rocks and fossils of the geologist; or stabs the immortality of the soul with the dissecting knife; or degrades the office of a poet, once consecrated to delight and to improve mankind, into the function of a fallen spirit, privileged by the pride of rank and talents, to burn, sink, and destroy all the hopes of the humble,—all the alliance of the contrite,—all that can support integrity in life, or smooth our passage to the final hour.”

In his fourth chapter, on the doctrine of the Trinity, having expressed his doubts whether any traces of this sublime mystery are really visible in the mythological systems of ancient or modern heathens, Mr. Esdaile gives the history of the doctrine of the Christian Trinity, and states the arguments from scripture, by which it is supported. He introduces this history by remarking, that

“There is one thing connected with this subject which cannot but strike every person as remarkable; the Trinity is no where announced, in the New Testament, as a new doctrine; neither is it any where formally taught: it is taken for granted, or stated as a matter of course, and referred to rather as a thing that was well known, than as a doctrine which had been unheard of before.” (p. 91.)

By an induction of particulars from the Old Testament scriptures, and from the works of ancient, but uninspired Jewish writers, especially Enoch, he justly concludes, that the Jewish people in the time of Christ regarded the doctrine as no novelty.

“They would not have been offended at the doctrine, that ‘The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us,’ had not Jesus of Nazareth, of whom this was predicated, appeared in a character and in circumstances so very different from what they expected. This is apparent from the gospel history. When our Lord was accused before the Jewish council, the High Priest said to him, ‘I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God.’ From this it is evident that they expected the manifestation of ‘The Christ, the Son of God.’ Our Lord answered the question indirectly by saying, ‘Hereafter ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right-hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.’ This is an evident allusion to Dan. vii. 13, 14. where it is said, ‘And behold one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom,’ &c. On hearing our Lord apply these words to himself, ‘the High-priest rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy, what farther need have we of witnesses?’ This incident proves two things; first, that the Jews considered the passage in Daniel, which our Lord applied to himself, as applicable to the Messiah; and

secondly, that, though he is there called 'the Son of man,' they nevertheless admitted that he was to be, in reality, 'the Son of God,' and to have a kingdom which should never be destroyed. This was the character which they recognized as belonging to the Messiah: and our Lord was judged guilty of blasphemy because he asserted that the words of the prophet were fulfilled in him." (Pp. 94—96.)

Is there not a discrepancy between the sentiment given at the commencement of the volume and that which is expressed in the fifth chapter? We quote the discordant passages:

"I do not, however affirm, that the mind, enlightened by general knowledge, would not arrive, even without the aid of revelation or tradition, at some idea of a first cause, or presiding principle. It seems next to impossible for a mind which has formed a notion of power and causation, (and these, surely, are among the first and strongest impressions which the mind receives, and are perfectly plain to all but those who attempt to account for them,) not to conceive of a power superior to that of man, as necessary for the production and arrangement of the visible phenomena of nature. The mind indeed is marvellously backward to form right conceptions on this subject; for though the invisible things of God are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, yet men, '*men changed the glory of the incorruptible God, into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things.*' But the question is not, whether men could acquire *right* conceptions of God, but whether they could acquire, by unaided reason, any conception of him at all; and I cannot but think that a mind, though ever so little improved in general knowledge, must entertain some idea of a first cause, on contemplating the visible universe." (Pp. 9—10.)

"We see nothing now at all analogous to creation. We see plants and animals endowed with a power of reproduction, which they derived from the Creator when he called them into existence, and which they continue to possess only in conformity to his will. But of creation, properly so called, we see no instance, whether we consider it as implying a production of organic substances out of nothing, or the formation of animated beings out of pre-existent materials. I do not see, then, how men could have formed any idea of creation: it is a matter of testimony; it is the result of faith, and not of reasoning, and hence it is that the apostle says, 'Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen, were not made of things which do appear.'" (P. 108.)

In another page the author, after avowing his scepticism as to the heathen philosophers entertaining any notions of the Deity, bordering upon a Trinity in union, nevertheless affirms that

"all the heathen cosmogonies, or accounts of creation, were written in imitation of the Jewish records."

This latter position we readily admit. Even a superficial

acquaintance with classic lore evinces that some of the fairest flowers of heathen poesy were culled from a hill more hallowed than Parnassus or Helicon, and that the historic muse caught all the rays of truth that fell upon her eye in early times, from the beaming countenance of the Hebrew sage. It is equally evident to us, that the Tritheistic figments of Plato and Pythagoras and the Hindoo Shasters, were the offspring of that propensity to pervert, rather than obey truth, which seems to enter into the very essence of fallen humanity: and if the historian and the poet visited the hill of Sion and the waters of Siloa, it is more than probable that the moral philosopher resorted to the same sacred regions.

On the moral degeneracy of mankind, and the transmission of a corrupt nature from the primogenitors of our race, we meet with much conclusive and some questionable reasoning. Of the latter description we reckon his apologetical claim upon divine mercy.

“ Indeed, I think the credit of human nature is more consulted by the doctrine of inherent transmission, than by that which maintains that we come into the world pure and untainted. It seems less dishonourable to us that our sins and imperfections, or, at least, the seeds of them, should descend to us by natural inheritance, than that they should be entirely of our own acquiring. We seem to be fitter objects of compassion from God, in some degree, if made subject to sin by inheritance, than if we may with more confidence, impute the guilt of sin to ourselves, since we are the heirs of mortality and corruption. Our sinful condition by nature seems almost to give us a right to Divine interference in our behalf. Sure I am, that the man who sees the full extent of his misery, and is convinced of the utter alienation of the natural heart from God, will not view the plan of deliverance through Christ with incredulous wonder. He will perceive that it is not more than the exigencies of the case required, or than might be expected from the overflowing mercy of God; though altogether unmerited on the part of man, whose claims can be founded only on his own helplessness, and whose plea can be addressed only to the free mercy and grace of God.” (Pp. 134, 135.)

Nor can we very well understand in what aspect the dispensation of the gospel can be contemplated, so that

“ It will no longer appear wonderful that God should interfere for the deliverance of creatures capable of such high attainments, but obviously sunk in ignorance and sin.” (P. 136.)

Truth gains no proselytes worth acquiring by mitigating the splendour of its intrinsic glory to suit the vitiated sight of scepticism and infidelity. Mysteries, which attract the admiring gaze of angelic minds, may, without impairing their

credibility, excite the adoring astonishment of beings, whose every faculty is enfeebled by the fall. The question must ever be reverting to a mind truly impressed and enlightened by sound doctrine, "Lord, what is man, that thou art mindful of him?"

To many of our readers Mr. Esdaille will appear to reason very inconclusively, when he argues against the doctrine of Adam's guilt being imputed to all of his descendants; for they will continue to read that doctrine in the inspired declaration, that "death passed upon all men, for that, or *in whom*, all have sinned;"—a declaration, as they conceive, attested by every infant's grave. They will give him credit for a more satisfactory train of reasoning, on the divine nature of Christ; and will with pleasure follow him through the conclusion of his sixth chapter, especially in his remark that

"Instead, then, of having any doubt whether we ought to yield religious homage to the 'Son of man,' we ought to conclude that there is no other way of worshipping God with acceptance but through him. There is a vast emphasis of meaning in our Lord's words, when he says, 'I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me.' These words not only imply that Christ is the way by which men come to the enjoyment of God in his heavenly kingdom, but that there is no other way in which we can form any accurate conception of him, or yield to him a rational service. 'No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.' This is the nearest approach to an open vision of the Almighty that ever has been, or can be made by mankind in the present world. We cannot behold him in his glory, for no man can see his face and live. But we see his glory shining with a mild radiance, and a qualified lustre, in the person of his Son, not so intense as to prevent us from approaching him, or deter us from imitating him; but drawing us to God by the most powerful attractions, and teaching us to aspire to the imitation and the enjoyment of the Father of our spirits. We are thus brought near to God by the incarnation of his Son, who assumed our nature that we might rise to the resemblance of his; and that, by imitating his example, and imbibing his spirit, we might at last vindicate our claim to the glorious title of sons of God." (Pp. 183, 184.)

Gratified as we have been by the general tenor of his remarks on the evidence deducible from prophecy, on one or two points, we should be disposed to join issue with him, and to dispute the ground he takes. He seems most unwarrantably to consider the accordance of secondary trains of events with the language of prophecy and its immediate fulfilment, as the result rather of some fortuitous coincidence, than as constituting part of an harmonious scheme, in which one prophetic oracle may apply to two or more future events, as

in the economy of providence one cause originates several consecutive and correspondent effects. We must read both the historical and prophetic books of the Scriptures through a new medium, before we can fully accede to the soundness of some of our author's conclusions in his seventh chapter: conclusions which he himself overturns in the subsequent chapter, when he admits that he is inclined to join those, who contend that our Lord's prediction concerning the destruction of Jerusalem applies also to the second coming of Christ and to the end of the world.

Our limits will not permit us to follow our author through his adduction of *internal* evidence to the support of a system of truths and morals, whose evident tendency to advance the happiness of man closely harmonizes with the manifest scheme acted upon by HIM, whose name is LOVE; nor can we go into the merits of his conclusive arguments, to prove, that "the limited notices of the atonement, which occur in our Lord's discourses, not only agree with the circumstances in which he was placed, but give us an interesting view of the fidelity of his biographers." The writer ably vindicates the goodness of the moral governor of the universe, in prescribing a perfect law to his creatures, in requiring unreserved obedience, and in confirming it by penal sanctions, because to have done less would have been an act of cruelty to man, since it must have had a necessary tendency to make him miserable.

In his twelfth chapter, where he treats "of the means by which the benefits procured by Christ are communicated to men," we conceive that Mr. Esdaile overshoots his mark, when he presumes that his

"statement of particulars will explain all the peculiarities of the apostle Paul's doctrine respecting the pre-eminence and sole efficacy of faith in Christ."

Nor can we assent to the construction he puts upon the decretal epistle of the first Christian council, held at Jerusalem, sent to the Gentile churches,

"that they might conform, if they chose, to the Jewish law, but they were not to be forced to do so."

The grand point at issue was, the necessity of circumcision, which some Jewish teachers had urged upon them. The Apostolic Council, while they evinced the most amiable candour and forbearance towards the prejudices of their Jewish brethren, *unanimously* denounced the *principle* of such a requisition to be subversive of the souls of the Gentile converts, and gave a public and unequivocal epitome of their own creed, when, after confessing, that the Jewish cere-

monial was a burden which neither they nor their fathers had been able to bear, they declared—"We believe, that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, we shall be saved even as they."

The thirteenth chapter is devoted to the doctrine of the Influence of the Holy Spirit in the production of faith and its rich variety of spiritual and moral fruits.

"This doctrine of spiritual influence may, indeed, be called a mystery; yet it is the least mysterious of all mysteries; it lies at the very foundation of all religious worship, and without it we can have no accurate conceptions of the nature and government of God. We worship him as a spirit: it is only a spiritual service that we can offer to him; it is only a spiritual intercourse that we can hold with him; it is only a spiritual inference, on his part, that we can expect. It is as an invisible spirit that we address him in our prayers; in the full assurance that the aspirations of our hearts are perfectly known to him whose spirit pervades the universe; and it is by the invisible agency of his spirit, overruling all events within the compass of creation, that we expect our prayers to be answered. Spiritual agency, then is implied in every prayer; and spiritual intercourse, in every act of worship; and they who deny them must, in order to be consistent, hold prayer to be an unmeaning form and every species of religious homage an idle ceremony." (Pp. 379, 380.)

On the long and too eagerly litigated subject, Predestination, Mr. Esdaile has expressed his sentiments in a manner becoming a student of that holy volume, which is the sole unerring standard of all doctrinal and moral verity. He has evidently listened to and pondered the divine oracles on this mysterious theme, with a mind prostrate before the teachings of a wisdom, whose length and breadth, whose height and depth even angelic intelligences cannot measure. We rejoice to see our divines sitting in the same school as the holy Leighton, and collecting their stores of sacred lore, not at the feet of metaphysical science and abstract reasoning, but, where saints and angels love to sit in lofty admiration and docile simplicity, at the footstool of him, whose revelations impart the twilight of knowledge to his church on earth, and its noon-tide brightness to his elect and redeemed in heaven. "*At verò in Cœli scrinia, atque adyta velle irrumpere, et arcana illa Imperii divini, ad ingenioli nostri modulum, ac methodos exigere, O quantæ est pervicaciæ, imò insanix! Equidem admirandum me hæere fateor, quoties viros doctos et theologos de ordine decretorum Dei temerè garrientes audio, vel lego.—De Deo et arcanis ejus cauti ac tremuli cogitate ac loquimini, disputate autem parcissimè. Et quicunque perdere te nolles, cave cum ipso disputes. Si quid peccas, te incusa;*

si quid boni feceris, aut a malo resipueris, *εὖ καὶ πικρὸν* Deo canas. Hæc sunt quæ vos moneo, in quibus et ipse acquiesco, et quo multum jactatus velut in portum me recepi." \*

We seldom have occasion to complain of this writer's phraseology. Now and then, however, we observe a careless flippancy of expression scarcely pardonable. We quote only one instance, occurring at the commencement of the fourteenth chapter.

"——the honours of the soul are immortal; and he who is *fortunate* enough to acquire them would not exchange them for the empire of the world."

The terms "fortunate" and "unfortunate," particularly when they are found in a work of this description, are offensive to a serious and devout mind, accustomed, as is such a mind, to trace up the cause of Christian excellence to a higher source than what is sometimes called a *fortunate* combination of circumstances, and to seek the origin of human delinquency and abuse of mercy at a depth much lower than *misfortune*.

We pass over the chapter on the resurrection, the judgment, and the future state of rewards and punishments. The concluding chapter is occupied with a review of the whole, some very candid and liberal statements respecting modes of divine worship, and a few hints on the most profitable method of studying theology. On the practical duties resulting from the reception of the gospel, we meet with but few remarks. We are given to understand that Mr. Esdaile has another work in contemplation, on Christian Ethics; and if he brings to his subject a mind thoroughly imbued with that high moral sense, which is generated in the soul by the Spirit of truth, and which is fostered by the sacred recollections of Bethlehem, Gethsemane, and Calvary, we shall welcome the fresh production of his pen, and gladly assign him a place among those Christian moralists, who have happily learned and taught obedience to the law upon the principles of the Gospel.

\* Leighton.



### III.—ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY.

1. *Lectures on Architecture*, comprising the History of the Art from the earliest times to the present day : By James Elmes, Architect. Second Edition. Priestley and Weale. 1823. 8vo. pp. 432.
2. *Memoirs of the Life and Works of Sir Christopher Wren*, with a brief View of the Progress of Architecture in England, from the beginning of the reign of Charles the First, to the end of the Seventeenth Century : and an Appendix of authentic documents. By JAMES ELMES, M.R. I. A. Architect. Priestley and Weale, 1823. 4to. pp. xxxvi.—532.—148.

It must be confessed that architectural information has been, till of late, at a low ebb among our countrymen. To the neglect which the art has experienced, there have been indeed honorable exceptions; but even among those who form the exceptions, the ardour of application has often been referable to professional demands, rather than persevering genius. We have been sufficiently alive to the glories of martial achievement, or the profits of extended commerce; but, to the elegancies and distinctions of art, we have been cold and indifferent. The bosoms of our fathers have glowed at the recital of the exploits of a Themistocles; but they have wanted a chord to respond to the praises of a Phidias. They have been wildered in the economical mazes of Adam Smith; but they have suffered the memory of Sir Christopher Wren to lie in inglorious slumber. At length a new page is opening in our history; patronage of Art begins to be fashionable, and the elements of Taste, to be deemed worthy of popular cultivation.

“The last reign, including the period of the regency, was the first to appropriate a large sum of the public money exclusively to the arts, in the purchase of the Townley, the Elgin, and the Phigaleian marbles; and the government of our present king deserves to be recorded as the first in English history to announce, in parliament, an intended public patronage of the arts, which conduce so much to the fame of a great and mighty nation. ‘As far as his majesty,’ said the ostensible minister of the crown, in the House of Commons, on the first meeting of parliament in the new reign, ‘had already presided over the councils of the nation, the result had been glorious. He trusted and was persuaded that his majesty would have the gratification of adding a new page of lustre to the English history: and that, as there was nothing

of glory left to achieve, his majesty would snatch the only remaining laurel, by cultivating the arts of peace." (Lectures, Pp. 9, 10.)

On the subject of patronage the lecturer observes, in another part of his work—

"I cannot refrain from again calling public attention to the importance of cultivating a pure taste in architecture, and of encouraging none but legitimate professors, who scorn to soil their hands with the anomalous and disgraceful practice of being builders and architects of the same concern. The present time, as I ventured to hint in my last Lecture, is most auspicious to the Arts, and our good or ill name to posterity now almost hangs upon a thread.

"I hope to be allowed a few more words, before closing, on some immediate causes of the present depressed state of architecture. Among the foremost of the list, is the want of a critical acquaintance with its excellencies and defects, in those whose situations enable them to be employers and patrons. This results partly from the difficulties professors themselves raise about the art, which should be publicly taught, as in Dean Aldrich's days, to the young nobility and gentry in both our Universities.

"But I place, without fear of contradiction, as a more immediate and fatal cause, the indiscriminate patronage and employment, by the public, of persons totally ignorant of every branch of education requisite to a knowledge of design. It would be easy to shew that this preparative education is necessary, but I apprehend it will readily be granted that much more than the acquirements and capacity of a mechanic, however intelligent, is requisite to the formation of an able architect. It is a well-known fact, that William of Wickham, Inigo Jones, Sir Christopher Wren, Sir John Vanburgh, Lord Burlington, and James Wyatt, were men of excellent education, and well versed in all the elements of fine art, literature, and science. Can magnificence, elegance, or good taste, be expected from men of inferior qualities? Do we gather grapes from thorns, or figs of thistles?" (Lectures, Pp. 128—130.)

Making allowance for the strong manner in which a professional man is likely to express himself on a topic, so nearly affecting his situation and interests as an *inefficient* or *misdirected patronage*, we cannot but subscribe to the general tenor of his observations. This defect of patronage, however, has arisen from an actual want of taste in the higher classes of our countrymen. It is true, that foreign travel has long made part of a genteel education, and our young nobles and gentlemen have personally visited the remains of Grecian and Roman structure; but the effect, as to the excitement of love of art, or discriminating perception of the sublime and beautiful in the works of genius, has been very partial. There may be much in the hint, thrown out by our author, of a deficiency in the system of academical education. If the minds of our students had been drawn to the conside-

ration of the principles of the fine arts, at a time when their affections were warmed and their admiration raised at the heroic deeds of ancient warriors or the lofty productions of ancient writers, it might have fostered the future Pericles, and cherished the embryo Augustus. Still it is probable that a very limited barrier would have been opposed to the powerful effects of national character and political circumstance.

But our lecturer takes up the same theme again in his third address, not however without a sort of apology.

"I must, ere I conclude, like Hamlet still harping upon the daughter of Polonius, still harp upon the necessity of public patronage, to enable our great and glorious country to elevate itself to a level with the Greeks in art. Such a judicious, liberal, and efficient patronage, as 'comes down as the rain, and distils as the dew, as the small rain upon the tender herb, and the showers upon the grass.' A patronage which a great government and an enlightened nation alone can give, and which is to the arts, what the Nile is to Egypt, the prolific source of all excellence." (Lectures, p. 174.)

Here, gentle reader, you have an enamoured prince, the dew of heaven, and a majestic river, brought before your view in such rapid succession, as just to allow you time to perceive that they form a string of comparisons about patronage! A dramatic allusion, a scriptural quotation, and a geographical simile, huddled together in exquisite confusion! This might be very amusing to the junior part of the diletanti of the Surrey or Russel Institutions; but really we could not pledge ourselves to *patronize* Mr. Elmes, unless he intend to build in chaister style than that in which he writes. Not to say, that we think the reference to Deut. xxxii. 2. as well as that to Matt. vii. 16, in the foregoing extract, to be in bad taste, and somewhat irreverent.

Our author then alludes to the language of Mr. Bromley, who some years ago reproached his countrymen, and certainly not without reason, for too confined liberality towards the professors of the fine arts. That gentleman observed that there is a great difference between the state of patronage in the modern world, and that which carried the arts to their high celebrity in ancient Greece. On the other hand, such reasoners as the critic Vasari maintain, that there is a great deal of fallacy in the argument which attributes so much impulsive power to patronage, and ask "Can patrons create artists?"—They then remind us of the fact, that some of the greatest works have been produced in obscurity, and while their authors were suffering under the oppressions of poverty. This, however, proves little more, than that genius is sufficiently energetic to break through all impediments. It may

be retorted, "If they do all this *without* your patronage, what would they not do *with* it?" It is often seen, too, that in minds capable of the highest exertions in art, but which unhappily want moral ballast, that very stimulus is required to make them work, if we may be allowed so to speak, which is afforded by the purse of a liberal friend. It would be painful to enumerate instances—let one suffice. The well-known painter, Morland, in his own line inimitable, was the subject of such vicious improvidence, as to be in continual embarrassment and pecuniary difficulties. But the very consciousness that he could command a good price for a picture from two or three generous patrons, used to rouse him at intervals from his idle and dissolute habits; and to this we owe some of his most spirited productions.

But society must have arrived at a determinate point of refinement, and that refinement must exist under particular circumstances, before patronage can be undertaken on an extensive scale. Till this is the case, there will be many candidates for the same rewards, who must be content to remain unnoticed; and art itself must proportionably suffer, not only for want of means of exercise, but also from an absence of that spirit of emulation, which, whenever it does not degenerate into faction or mannerism, is one of the chief promoters of excellence and distinction. This we take to be a true and unprejudiced view of the question of patronage, about which so much has been said; and if there be any justice in our observations, they apply more to the architect than to any other professor; for a man may write a poem in a garret, or paint a picture in a cellar, but he cannot build a palace without an employer.

When Sir Joshua Reynolds delivered his first discourse at the Royal Academy, he congratulated the members on the advantages which would flow from such an institution, and rejoiced in the disposition manifested by many leading characters to become amateurs and patrons of the fine arts, under the example of a popular monarch; and at the same time observed, "It is indeed difficult to give any other reason why an empire like that of Britain should so long have wanted an ornament so suitable to its greatness, than that slow progression of things, which naturally makes elegance and refinement the last effect of opulence and power." The ardent anticipations of the President, however, have been more realized in the improvement of artists themselves, than in the number or enthusiasm of their patrons. As far as the government has been concerned, an apology for limited patronage has been usually found in the contrariety of its avocations,

and the imperative calls for other appropriation of the national resources. But Mr. Burke went perhaps a little too far in asserting, that it was quite hopeless that much attention should be paid by administration to the fine arts; inasmuch as our statesmen, either from their education, or from their various occupations, could not be skilled in matters of that kind. For statesmen may be munificent patrons, without being exquisite critics; and there is a call on those who can influence the character of nations, to promote the general cause of morality and intellectual refinement by encouraging pursuits which tend to cultivate the pleasures of the mind, rather than those of sense.

Meantime, the plan of delivering lectures on the art itself, if taken up by judicious hands, is evidently calculated to remove a great portion of the ignorance that exists, and to awaken such inquiry into its principles as may lead to important results. Mr. Elmes has very properly confined himself to an historical view of the subject in his first course, as a natural introduction to the detail of criticism which we presume is to follow; or to speak in his own way, as a wise master-builder, he has been careful to lay a foundation suited to his intended superstructure. It has been his aim to render his addresses as popular as the technical nature of his theme would admit, preparatory to more practical investigation.

He commences by an "historical sketch of the Art among the ancient Jews, Assyrians, Chaldeans, Egyptians, and Phœnicians; more particularly considered in Egypt, with illustrative examples and description of its style and modes of construction." There is a good deal of common-place matter of general history in the primary lecture, offering nothing particularly worthy our notice as elucidatory of the principles of the art in these its earliest ages, till we come to the consideration of Egyptian masonry, a curious and marvellous subject, and which has derived peculiar interest from the discoveries of modern travellers.

"The art of building with such immense blocks of stone as we find in the Egyptian buildings must have cost their first architects much thought and study. These immense masses of such hard and ponderous materials, and the astonishing size of their columns, give their buildings an appearance of grandeur and simplicity, that even at first sight inspires ideas of wonder and delight.

"But, upon inspection, a want of symmetry of proportion, and of elegance is apparent. The ornaments are often misplaced, ill-applied, crowded and executed in a dry and hard style. The architecture of Egypt sprung rapidly to a certain degree of perfection, beyond which it never improved, because the political institutions of the country, and the attachment of the people to their ancient customs and man-

ners were averse from alteration or improvement. Neither were they likely to derive their architectural knowledge from other nations, when, according to Diodorus and Strabo, one of their first maxims was, never to leave their own country; and one of their first political institutions, to exclude all strangers from it; and least of all was it likely they should borrow from India, when the Indians left their own country as little as the Egyptians.

"Before coming to the details of the Egyptian buildings, I will analyze and describe the character of their architecture. The characteristics or elementary principles of Egyptian architecture are walls of a great thickness; roofs generally of a single block of stone, which reached from one wall to another; a multiplicity of columns, some of which are square, some octangular, some with sixteen faces, and more round upon their plan. The proportions as well as the decorations of the columns vary in almost every example, and rarely approach the regularity and dignity of an order. They seldom had bases, and when they had, they mostly consisted of mere plinths, or a few simple water caves, enveloping a small portion of the bottom of the shaft. Their capitals varied considerably, sometimes being only a simple die or abacus, either plain or covered with hieroglyphics. Sometimes they are ornamented with foliage; in some they resemble a vase; in others a bell reversed. Their most usual ornaments are palm leaves, and those which are the most decorated may be reckoned among the least ancient. In this style of architecture there is no frieze, nor properly speaking any architrave or cornice, and their substitutes are either; for something resembling them may be traced in the epistylia or beams of stone which reach from column to column.

"Another characteristic of the Egyptian style is a peculiar narrowness of intercolumniation, being often not more than three feet and a half. The want of the principle of the arch, which is mostly supplied by epistylia, or stone beams, or lintels, is also another and peculiar characteristic of this original style. Dr. Pococke thinks that the ancient Egyptians were not entirely ignorant of the construction of the arch, but does not give satisfactory proofs of his conviction: and the president Goguet, in his learned dissertation on the origin of laws, arts, and sciences, assumes, from their not using it in their temples, that they did not understand it. The proofs which the author gives in his third volume of monuments, drawn from Egypt, that the Egyptians were ignorant of the art of making vaults or arches, might as well be drawn to establish their contempt of this mode of construction, and their preference for the colossal masses they used to cover their apertures, and which reach from column to column, and from wall to wall. The subject must remain conjectural; yet the nearest approaches that I am at present aware of, to this scientific element of modern architecture, are exhibited in the entrance of the great pyramid at Memphis. It is but justice however to M. Goguet, to say that these discoveries are since the period of his writing.

"Signor Belzoni, our most recent traveller in Egypt, who has seen more of what may be termed imitated Egyptian buildings, and whose

works I have only seen since writing the above, agrees with my pre-conceived opinion of their *complete knowledge of the arch*, and appears to have produced ample proofs of this curious fact. He found Egyptian arches at Thebes, and one at Gournon, under the rocks that separate this place from the valley Beban el Malook." (Pp. 42—45.)

Yet the author tells us farther on :

"The immense size of many of the coverings of apertures, and whole roofs of temples formed of one entire stone, still extant in Egypt, would stagger belief, if the truth were not so well authenticated. One important fact is hereby proved; namely, that the *principle of the arch was then unknown*, or they certainly would not have transported the roof of the temple of Latona at Butis, from the island of Philoe, as Herodotus testifies, a distance of nearly two hundred leagues. It was the most enormous block of stone ever moved by human power, and contained above one hundred and forty four thousand cubic feet, weighing above twenty millions of pounds avoirdupois." (Pp. 275, 276.)

He states in the fourth Lecture :

"The Etruscan buildings in which arches are found are among the *most ancient* examples of their architecture; and several of them, but especially their subterraneous reservoirs, prove that their architects were *well acquainted* with the construction of the arch." (P. 228.)

Yet he adds a few pages after :

"The Etruscans have left some specimens of very ancient methods of construction; and to them has been attributed the invention of building with small pieces of stone joined together by calcareous cements, because in their country are found the earliest examples of this method of construction. But it is to the Romans that the greatest praise is due for construction in this way; for to them must be attributed at least the *earliest use*, ~~is not the invention of the arch~~ and the cupola, together with the building of walls and arches of small stones and bricks cemented together, of bridges, of aqueducts, and of sewers." (P. 281.)

The first requisite in a Lecturer, is perspicuity of statement. He is presumed to have scientific information, and critical ability, by his very occupation of the seat of public instruction. But it is a prime professional excellence to be at once so correct and lucid, as to be intelligible to the tyro, and acceptable to the adept. We fear, however, that to the fault of verbiage which is so common with Mr. Elmes, we must add those of obscurity and contradiction. What were his audience to think of such *pro* and *con* declarations? How edifying must it have been to learn from the chair of authority, first, that the Egyptians wanted the principle of the arch—secondly, that their knowledge of it was complete—thirdly, that its principle was unknown to them—fourthly, that the most ancient Etruscans were well acquainted with its construction—and fifthly, that to the Romans must be attributed its earliest

use, if not its invention ! Instead of all this vacillation—instead of informing us, that he had seen Mr. Belzoni's work after he had prepared his address, which, by the way, is no reason why he should not have qualified his expressions—how much more consistent would it have been, to have fairly stated that the real origin of the arch was still a desideratum ; and that those best qualified to judge, considered the ancient architects of Misraim as unacquainted with its construction. If however, the lecturer proceeded to notice the discoveries of any recent travellers as tending to the opposite conclusion, he was bound to shew what was the nature of these communications which would justify a change of opinion. The question is, has there been found in ancient Egyptian masonry, that distinct and important member the arch, composed of regular radiated voussoirs, with the key-stone ? Were the brick archings and vaultings seen in the entrance-passages to the tombs of the Thebaid, the remains of aboriginal workmanship, or the production of Greeks or Saracens ? The investigation must be conducted with a jealous feeling that Pococke, and other oriental travellers, may have been much deceived by appearances. The assumption of Goguet, though a man confessedly of more erudition than science, seems entitled to more respect than it meets from our author. He had good grounds for supposing this people ignorant of the arch, from its absence in their temples ; but he could have none for supposing that they would have despised it, if known, from their predilection for the colossal and stupendous. An acquaintance with its geometric principle would rather have led such architects to outspan one another. The figure itself is agreeable. The savage sees and admires it in the bow of heaven, and the lunar crescent. The idea is connected with his earliest associations, and would be apparent in his rudest constructions. Even the poor Esquimaux hollows the parallel blocks of ice, with which he builds his arctic tenement, into arches and cupolas ; and the dwellings of the ancient Britons, composed of stakes and wattling, or uncemented ashlar, were either cylinders, with domed roofs and arched entrances, or of shapes, not unlike great tea-canisters in grocer's shops, an opening being left in the top for emission of smoke, as appears from the curious engraving of Gaulish houses, which they resembled, in Montf. Suppl. 3. v. 2. c. 8.—There is no reason therefore, *a priori*, why we should not discover correspondent appearances on the banks of the Nile, as far as the figure of the arch is concerned ; while we trust we shall stand excused with Mr. Elmes for withholding too ready an assent to the conclusion which he



seems inclined to draw, that the ancient Egyptians were, after all that has been supposed to the contrary, acquainted with this scientific element in architecture.

Upon some other points, however, we are rather more disposed than Mr. E. to allow them experimental acquirement or traditionary information. He frequently expresses admiration, at the huge masses which they contrived to lift up, transport, &c. This is certainly remarkable; but our astonishment may be carried to excess, and border on the amazement which led our good forefathers to attribute such doings to genii and demons. The great pyramid, prior certainly to the time of Abraham, argues, in its construction, considerable acquaintance with mechanics, as its exhibition of a correct meridian shews at the same time advancement in the science of astronomy. Pliny tells us, that the obelisks were brought to Thebes from the quarries, by means of a canal; that the workmen rested them across the stream upon the opposite banks, and then placed vessels loaded with bricks under them, which, being lightened of their freight, rose and lifted them up. Large stones were moved by affixing strong iron axles in each end, and inserting them in broad wheels. Massy beams were raised upon high columns, by putting two cross pieces under their centres, mutually contiguous, and then suspending baskets of sand to one end, till they tilted up the other, under which they placed a support, proceeding to do the same at the opposite extremity, and so in succession, till they had attained the desired elevation. Sometimes a capstan was erected, round which a strong cable was wound, which was fastened to the block, and the capstan was turned with long horizontal levers. There are other particulars to be gathered from ancient writers, which cannot escape the notice of careful readers, affording strong presumption that much knowledge of the principles of mechanics formed part of the "wisdom of the Egyptians."

We cannot agree with our author in his account of Jewish architecture. He tells us, that

"the temples which the Israelites had seen in Egypt, dedicated to the Egyptian idols, led them to consecrate a temple, where they might assemble in public worship of the true God. As it was necessary, from their mode of life during their sojournment in the wilderness, that it should be portable, they constructed it in the form of a spacious tent. In the plan and general appearance of this temporary building, known by the name of the Tabernacle, they took, it has been conjectured, the form of the Egyptian temples for their guide; but in the details and ornaments, they adopted a peculiar and national style."

What then are we to understand by certain passages in an old authority, which we suppose Mr. Elmes reverences as well as ourselves? "Let them make me a sanctuary; that I may dwell among them. According to all that I shew thee, after the pattern of the tabernacle, and the pattern of all the instruments thereof, even so shall ye make it." Exodus xxv. 8, 9.—"Moses was admonished of God, when he was about to make the tabernacle: for, See, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount." Hebrews viii. 5. In the dealing of Providence, it was so ordered that the Egyptians should furnish the Israelites with materials for the construction of their place of worship; but so far are we from believing that the latter took the form of the temples of their idolatrous tyrants for their guide, that we conceive they were directed by Jehovah to use a construction altogether dissimilar, and with a designed and marked difference of feature. But our author proceeds:

"The Jews used this moveable temple for a length of time after the conquest of Palestine; but under the reign of Solomon, they constructed a permanent temple at Jerusalem.—In the principal front was the *ulam*, probably a grand portico, such as they had formerly seen in several Egyptian temples, the construction of which may serve to explain this of Solomon. The temples of the ancients were generally without windows; but that of Jerusalem appears to have had them, and of the same form as those observed in the ruins of the great temple of Thebes. The timbers of the ceiling were of cedar, and it appears that the roof was flat like the Egyptian temples.—Before the *ulam* were two columns of brass—these were no doubt intended as a decoration to the whole, like the obeliaks which were placed before the Egyptian temples." (Pp. 116—118.)

Our author, indeed, confesses that the accounts of this building are not sufficiently clear to enable us to form a precise idea of it. He will allow us nevertheless to say, that such an idea as we can form, is very different from his own. That the word **אולם** may take the sense of *portico*, has the sanction of Kimshi. It does not always, however, mean this, but sometimes an arch or a vault; and neither Kimshi, Maimonides, nor Josephus, have thrown sufficient light on the original description in the Bible, to justify us in supposing it bore any resemblance to an Egyptian portico. "The spreading of the porch," says Lightfoot, "in length was an hundred cubits, and in height an hundred and twenty cubits higher than the height of the temple: and this porch, which was a cross building to the temple itself, and so high above it, may not improperly be conceived to be that place whither Satan brought our Saviour in his temptation, when he is said

to have brought him *ἐν περιστροφῇ* *στέπας*, properly, to the wing of the temple." He adds, that there were "steps, that rose up out of the court into this entrance, which were twelve in number, every step half a cubit rising, six cubits in the whole rise; and so much was the floor of the porch higher than the floor of the court." As to its design, we are told, 1 Chron. xxviii. 11. "David gave to Solomon his son the *pattern* of the porch, and of the houses thereof, and of the treasures thereof, and of the upper chambers thereof, and of the inner parlours thereof, and of the place of the mercy-seat, and the pattern of all that he had *by the Spirit*." With respect to the locality of the two pillars, Lightfoot observes again: "The place where these pillars stood is somewhat uncertain: the text indeed saith, they stood before the house, 2 Chron. iii. 15, and before the temple, ver. 17: but yet it is to seek, whether within the porch at the entering in, or without the porch, or within the porch at the temple-door, which last is the opinion of Rabbi Sol. upon the text cited." Works, vol. I. p. 1076, fol. edit.

We are the more tenacious on this question of resemblance, found by our Lecturer, because we think professional men should be cautious of raising hypotheses which are not reconcileable with the sense of scripture. It is well known that the temple built by Onias, in the district of Heliopolis, furnished a strong contrast to the surrounding religious structures; and the difference arose from its similarity to the fabric on mount Zion. This fancy of tracing a resemblance between the temple of God and those of idols, originated with Spencer. "I am sensible," says Shuckford, "that Dr. Spencer has endeavoured to prove, that both the Jewish tabernacle and temples were erected in imitation of the places of worship made use of by the heathen nations; but whoever shall take the pains to consider what this learned writer has offered upon this subject, will be surprised that he could be satisfied with such slender proofs in favour of his opinion." In fact, the writer just quoted, in common with some others, considers the tabernacle of Israel as the first structure for religious worship ever erected. The able architect Wilkins, is of opinion, that the temple of Jerusalem, of a fine oblong square shape, might have furnished the proportions of sacred architecture to Greece and Italy, to become, in the course of ages, classic models for Christian churches; a probability which would lead us to much interesting speculation.

We incline, with our author, to bring the Grecian orders from the banks of the Nile. The Egyptians themselves indeed knew nothing of these orders; but in their columnar

architecture there seem to have been the elements of Grecian ornament and distinction. Denon traced, as he imagined, the origin of the Ionic volute, the caulicoles of the Corinthian capital, and the guttæ of the Doric entablature; and at Philæ, he observed the lotus, in the capitals of the columns, gracefully interlaced with Ionic and Composite volutes.

"A colony at first always imitates its mother country, and afterwards as surely does all in its power to render its origin forgotten. When I refer to the present examples, surely the Egyptian origin of the Corinthian capital cannot be denied. Their elements are incontestibly the same, namely, a vase surrounded by flowers, and covered with an abacus: the story of the Corinthian girl was probably invented by a Grecian poet, and related as genuine, by Vitruvius.

"In corroboration of the Egyptian origin of the Greek order, I take leave to bring forward as an additional authority, the learned M. Quatremere de Quincy, the present secretary to the French Academy, who supposes that even the Ionic also was borrowed from the Egyptians, and is a beautiful adaptation of their capitals of the head of Isis. As the learned Frenchman's hypothesis possesses considerable ingenuity, I will endeavour to explain and illustrate it. The ears of the Egyptian capital, he metamorphoses into the Grecian volutes; the braids of hair on the forehead, into the helixes or threads of the capital; the throat, into the coloring or necking; and so on.

"Following up this hypothesis, the Doric may also be said to have been drawn from the rude types or prefigurations of the Egyptians, which contain all the elements of the beautiful examples of the Greeks. Belzoni says, that the Isis of the Egyptians is the same personage with the Io of the Greeks; therefore capitals designed after the head of this goddess are Isis-like, Io-like, or Ionic." P. 172.

The seventh Lecture, making allowance for some etymological affectation, is interesting and instructive. It treats on the Origin and History of Architecture in Great Britain and Ireland, on Gothic structures, and on the introduction of Italian Architecture into England, with the torpid state of the art under the first and second, and its revival under the third George. We are pleased with the little which Mr. E. has said on the subject of *Gothic building*; and we think he could not do better, in a second course of Lectures, than to make it his principal theme. No division of his art would afford greater scope for gratifying illustration, and popular remark. To Englishmen it is peculiarly interesting; and while the attention of our population is called to the enactments of its Legislature concerning "New Churches," it will derive additional interest from its relation to our ecclesiastical history.

To the improvement which the art will experience from

multiplying specimens of Grecian fabrics we are fully sensible; and we certainly must congratulate our countrymen on the good taste which is rearing copies of ancient models, distinguished for purity and elegance, instead of certain absurd and unclassical edifices, which we could name, and which have made some of our churches look like any thing rather than places appropriated to the celebration of Christian worship. But there is something in an ecclesiastical edifice of Gothic construction, which raises emotions in the breast of the spectator—sentimental indeed, rather than spiritual—but which can never be excited by the counterpart of a pagan temple. “One must have taste,” says Horace Walpole, “to be sensible of the beauties of Grecian architecture; one only wants passions to feel Gothic.” Our cathedrals and abbeys are venerable piles, testifying to the art and industry of what are called *the dark ages*. Their erection was matter of great public concern. Their artificers were encouraged by pontiffs, sovereigns, prelates, and nobles. Their forms and ornaments were determined by the symbolic taste of the Societies of Free and Accepted Masons. And who can so far forget their historical connexions—who can so completely divest them of their collegiate and ecclesiastic associations—or so unworthily estimate the effect produced by their long-drawn aisles, their clustered shafts, their fretted roofs, their elaborate traceries, their sculptured shrines, their storied windows—as not to confess that they possess a charm unknown to Grecian or Roman composition? Milton was too candid not to acknowledge its influence; he felt a solemnity of mind as he walked their hallowed precincts, and merged the austerity of the puritan in the sensation of the poet. The pride of science may stigmatize these fabrics as the relics of barbarism, and pronounce them destitute of taste, of order, of uniformity; but we cannot subordinate our feelings to the tyranny of abstract reasoning. We may argue on comparative fitness of construction; but we cannot steel ourselves against the impression produced by that combination of pleasing forms, to which the affections have yielded a willing homage, ere the judgment has been directed by established rules of art. Thus stands the case between the two great styles. We must not however be understood as conceding too much on the part of mediæval builders, to such as are ready to censure their want of mathematical knowledge or philosophic penetration. They have had powerful defenders even in these respects. “To those usually called Gothic architects,” says Sir William Chambers, “we are indebted for the first considerable improvements in construction;

there is a lightness in their works, an art and boldness of execution, to which the ancients never arrived, and which the moderns comprehend and imitate with difficulty."

"England is the classic soil for this style of architecture, as ancient Greece is for that of the orders, and here the student must come to measure and to study it. York Minster, is the Parthenon of Gothic architecture, Westminster Abbey the Theseum, and the chapel of Henry the Seventh the monument of Lysicrates. Among the finest specimens is the venerable abbey church of St. Alban's in Hertfordshire, which is also one of the most valuable documents in the archæological history of the country, as it embraces most of the successive styles in great variety from the Saxon to the pointed style.

"Gothic architecture disdains the trammels and the systems of the schools; nevertheless it has its own laws, its genera and their species, although they have not yet been arranged in a grammatical form. Batty Langley endeavoured, it is true, to reduce it to a system, and to engraft on it the five orders of the Palladian school, instead of a more natural and philosophical arrangement; but this effort was altogether nugatory." (Pp. 373, 374.)

The classic style was introduced into England by Inigo Jones, and Sir Christopher Wren. Of the latter, notice is taken by our author several times in the course of his lectures; but he forbore entering more fully into his merits, as, with a respect for this great master of his art which does him credit, he was engaged in preparing a separate account of his Life and Works. Mr. Elmes felt a sort of professional indignation at the neglect with which the memory of this wonderful architect had been treated, and resolved to supply, according to his ability, what appeared to him a desideratum in the literature of his country. In no province of letters does caprice in the selection of subjects appear more frequently than in that of Biography. Our presses abound with narratives of characters, who, to say the least, can but interest in a partial direction, or a limited circle; while the memoirs of extraordinary men, the great master-spirits of their day, are suffered to decay in inglorious oblivion, or afford topics of occasional reference in our common historical dictionaries, where they lie almost undistinguished among a heap of trivial and comparatively uninteresting matter. In the preface to his "Memoirs," Mr. E. observes, that Wren "experienced the ingratitude of cotemporaries, and the apathy of successors, in a more extraordinary degree than perhaps ever befel a man of equal talents, or equal public utility, and of equal celebrity." This perhaps may be going rather too far. We feel however with the author, that the general ignorance which has prevailed concerning a man, whose name has been on the lips of every one, and who has reared for himself so many monu-

ments of superior skill and industry, is discreditable to the country of which he is such a remarkable ornament.

"With Pope, Addison, Swift, Atterbury, Arbuthnot, and Gay, for witnesses of his full-blown fame, not a solitary distich could either afford him at his unnoticed death; though the German Kneller has been more immortalized by the pen of Pope than by his own pencil. But the man from whose comprehensive mind arose the majestic cathedral of St. Paul, and the fifty parochial churches of London—the royal and magnificent hospital of Greenwich—the no less appropriate and useful one at Chelsea—the most splendid ornaments of our metropolis—the most useful structures of our two universities,—he, who was at once our greatest architect, mathematician, and philosopher; the most learned man of his day, who may be most justly named the British Archimedes, was old, was the victim of political intrigue, and had no longer the countenance of royalty, which had smiled upon him for nearly three quarters of a century. He and native talent were out of fashion; and when ingratitude and the injustice of intriguing foreigners robbed him of his rights, his honours, and his well-earned rewards, the wits, the poets of the day, suffered this unequalled man to sink into the silent grave unnoticed but by his beloved son, Christopher, who erected the small mural monument in the crypt of St. Paul's, and began his work illustrative of his honoured ancestors."\* (Pp. vii, viii.)

A sketch of the life of Sir Christopher, may serve to introduce some remarks on the criticisms offered by his biographer, and the merits of his composition.

He was born at East Knoyle, in Wiltshire, the rectory of his father, Dr. Christopher Wren, afterwards dean of Windsor, on the 20th of October 1632. On the paternal side he was of Danish origin, but his mother was daughter and heiress of Robert Cox, of Fonthill, Esquire. His uncle Matthew, was Bishop of Ely, at a time when to be connected with the hierarchy was a distinction more than commonly perilous, for he was impeached by the Commons in 1641, and imprisoned in the Tower nearly twenty years.

"Of his firmness in adversity the following anecdote of him and his illustrious nephew is a lively and illustrative proof. Some time before the decease of Oliver Cromwell, Mr. Christopher Wren, the bishop's nephew, (afterwards Sir Christopher) became acquainted with Mr. Claypole, who married Oliver's favourite daughter. Claypole being a lover of the mathematics, had conceived a great esteem for young Wren, and took all occasion to cultivate his friendship, and to court his conversation, particularly by frequent invitations to his house and table. It happened at one of these invitations that Cromwell came into the room as they sat at dinner, and without any ceremony, as was his usual way in his own family, he took his place. After a

\* *Parentalia: or Memoir of the Family of the Wrens.* Folio. London. 1750.

little time, fixing his eyes on Mr. Wren, he said, 'Your uncle has been long confined in the Tower.' 'He has so, Sir,' replied Wren; 'but he bears his afflictions with great patience and resignation.'

"Cromwell. 'He may come out if he will.'

"Wren, 'Will your highness permit me to tell him this from your own mouth?'

"Cromwell. 'Yes, you may.'

"As soon as Wren could retire with propriety, he hastened with no little joy to the Tower, and informed his uncle of all the particulars of this interview with Cromwell. After which the bishop replied, with warm indignation, that it was not the first time he had received the like intimation from that miscreant; but he disdained the terms proposed for his enlargement, which were a mean acknowledgment of his favour, and an abject submission to his detestable tyranny; that he was determined to tarry the Lord's leisure, and owe his deliverance, which was not far off, to him only." (Life, p. 6.)

In his fourteenth year, Wren was admitted gentleman commoner of Wadham College, Oxford. Dr. Wilkins, the warden, introduced him as a prodigy to Prince Charles, Elector Palatine, to whom he presented some mechanical instruments of his own invention. In the foregoing year he had planned and executed an astronomical instrument, and pneumatic machine. The letter which he addressed to the Prince on sending him the former, and the Latin verses which accompanied the present of the "*Panorganum Astronomicum*" to his father, testify to the genius and talent of this astonishing youth. As he advanced in life, he displayed power in mathematical investigation, practical mechanism, historical research, classic lore, anatomical science, natural philosophy, and imitative art. At once versatile and energetic, acute and laborious, he could pass from one study to the other with a readiness, only to be equalled by the diligence with which he sought to surmount the difficulties which presented themselves in either. His mind seemed to rise to the occasion, and to glory as it were in the trial of its strength. His motto might have been,

"Non juvat ex humili lecta corona jugo."

Before he was fifteen, he had a patent granted him for seventeen years, for a diplographic instrument, or machine for writing with two pens; and soon after invented a weather-clock, and an instrument to write with in the dark, composed a treatise on spherical trigonometry, and an essay on the reformation of the fables of the signs of the zodiac in Latin hexameters. At eighteen, he proceeded B. A. and discovered the art of drawing enlarged views of subjects as they appear through a microscope. His next productions were a tract



on the theory of the planet Saturn, and an algebraic paper on the Julian period, which was published in the *Prolegomena* to the fifth edition of *Helvici Theatrum Historicum et Chronologicum*. In 1653 he was elected fellow of All-souls, and took his master's degree. The following extract from Evelyn's "Diary" at this period is interesting :

"1654, July 11, was the Latin Sermon, which I could not be at, though invited, being taken up at All Souls, where we had music, voices, and theorbes, performed by some ingenious scholars. After dinner I visited that *miracle of a youth*, Mr. Christopher Wren, nephew to the Bishop of Ely."

During his residence at the University, he was distinguished for his anatomical science, and made some curious experiments in the injection of liquors into the veins of animals. In 1657, he "left the studious privacy of the college for the bustling action of the metropolis," and was chosen to succeed Mr. Rooke as Professor of Astronomy at Gresham College.

"His inaugural oration, delivered in Latin from the astronomy chair, to perhaps as learned an audience as was ever assembled, and which is preserved in Ward's *Lives of the Gresham Professors*, is an elegant and elaborately finished piece of latinity. He addresses himself with respectful awe to his great and eminent auditory, so different both in audience and lecturers, to the Gresham lectures of this day. He finds among them the learned, the polite, the noble of his time. He was succeeding an able and favourite professor. He was young, inexperienced, and unused to a metropolitan society, whom he knew and felt to be more of the quality of judges than auditors or students, and therefore modestly apologised for his juvenile blushes and failings, which at his age might appear as if prematurely covetous of fame. Entering into his theme, he boldly censured the Dutch writers, whose swelling title pages announced to whom their works were useful; and declined giving any encomium on astronomy, as being as useless as to commend the strength of Hercules, or the brightness of the Sun. He entered deeply, and as it appears, satisfactorily to his enlightened and inquiring auditory, into all the necessary investigations of his subject." (P. 54.)

His lectures were attended by many scientific characters, who formed themselves into a club, containing the elements of what afterward became the Royal Society. On the death of Oliver Cromwell, the club was forced to disperse, as their place of meeting became a quarter for soldiers; and the professor returned to Oxford, where he studied chemistry under Peter Sthael of Strasburg, who was brought to Oxford by Robert Boyle. He came up to London to read some lectures on the nature and properties of light and refraction. A few days before the restoration of Charles II., he was admitted Savilian professor at the university, on the resignation of

Dr. Seth Ward. The Royal Society was now formed, of which he was one of the first and most respected members; and proved his claim to that distinction by a work on solar eclipses, and a series of papers on the subject of finding the longitude. He next completed for the king a lunar globe, which Bishop Sprat describes as "representing not only the spots and various degrees of whiteness upon the surface, but the hills, eminences, and cavities moulded in solid work. The globe, thus fashioned into a true model of the moon, as you turn it to the light represents all the monthly phases, with a variety of appearances that happen from the shadows of the mountains and the vallies."

Indefatigable in philosophic experiment, he furnished continual matter for record on the books of the New Society; and it is observable, how many modern discoveries appear to have been anticipated by his energetic mind. In 1662, he presented to the Society "some cuts done by himself in a new way of etching; whereby, he said, he could almost as soon do a subject on a plate of brass or copper as another could draw it on a crayon with paper." Known to be skilful in architecture, he was appointed, in the first year of the Restoration, assistant surveyor-general of the works to Sir John Denham; and in this character was ordered to survey St. Paul's, and prepare designs for the repair of that fabric. Inigo Jones had recently repaired the old choir, and cased much of the building with Portland stone, had rebuilt the north and south fronts, and raised his Corinthian portico at the west end. One cannot but regret the architectural labour which must have been thrown away on this metropolitan temple. It is well known that an old plumber confessed on his death-bed, that he had left a pan full of coals in the steeple, when he left his work to go to dinner, and that the wood having caught fire, the ancient steeple and upper roof of the church and aisles were consumed in four hours. This accident occurred in 1561, and was attributed, at the time, to a stroke of lightning. Through the liberality of Queen Elizabeth, and joint subscriptions of the clergy and citizens, the roofs were soon reconstructed and covered with lead, but the steeple was not rebuilt. The edifice was further repaired under James I. and Charles I.; and then followed the more extensive labour of Jones, which made a strange medley of the whole. The original nave was supported by clustered pillars and round arches, in a mixed Saxon and Norman style. The galleries and windows of the transepts were also finished with rounded arches. The chapter-house, on the south-side, was an elaborate and beautiful Gothic structure,

and this remained in pristine grandeur, while the church itself was disfigured by balls, cherubim, scrolls, and obelisks, with Roman windows, and the Grecian portico already mentioned, designed as an ambulatory for those noisy persons who had been accustomed to walk in the church, in hot or cold weather, to the great disturbance of the service performing in the choir. It may easily be conceived how much the good taste of Wren must have been offended with this heterogenous pile, and how little gratifying must have been the office of continuing its repair.

While engaged in examining and reporting on the state of the dilapidated cathedral, he designed a new theatre for Oxford, and a chapel for Pembroke College, Cambridge, to be reared at the sole expense of his uncle, the bishop. These studies, however, could not divert him from his beloved philosophy, and anatomical engagements with Dr. Thomas Willis, for whom he executed some drawings illustrative of the brain, which were much esteemed for their accuracy.

"In the course of this year (1665) Wren left England, with an intention of visiting the classic soils of France and Italy, to complete his studies as an architect. He was at this time considerably employed; his mathematical and constructive knowledge was undoubted; but, as a fine art, architecture had not been cultivated in England, except by Wren's great predecessor, Inigo Jones. In this department of his art he felt his deficiencies; and he determined to read his Vitruvius amidst the ruins of the glorious edifices, on which this master of our art had founded his precepts." (Pp. 170, 171.)

Of this same excursion Walpole observes, somewhat sneeringly, after noticing his succession to Sir John Denham, in 1668: "Three years before that he had visited France—and unfortunately went no farther. The great number of drawings he made there, from their buildings, had but too visible influence on some of his own—but it was lucky for Sir Christopher, that Louis XIV. had erected palaces only, no churches. St. Paul's escaped, but Hampton Court was sacrificed to the god of false taste." He adds, however, in a note, "I have been assured, by a descendant of Sir Christopher, that he gave another design for Hampton Court, in a *better taste*, which Queen Mary wished to have had executed, but was over-ruled." *Anecdotes of Painting*, vol. iii. p. 96.

It appears, from some observations of our author, (pp. 445, 6.) that such is most likely to be the fact; and it is due to the memory of Wren that it should be so understood. Mary had considerable taste in architecture, as well as in other arts, but her royal consort had much less, though he felt a great esteem for Sir Christopher. The Queen died after two

suites of the royal apartments were finished, and Wren did little afterwards towards the completion of the work.

The cause of his early return from the continent is not explained. The multiplicity of his engagements was probably the reason; as we find him returning with ardour to his usual philosophical and architectural studies. In the midst of the intricacies which were involved in the designs for the reparation of the cathedral, happened that memorable event, the fire of London! And it was the doom of this venerable edifice to experience a second conflagration yet more destructive than the first. The Royal Society were naturally employed in proposing plans for the rebuilding of the city; and Evelyn, Hooke, and Wren, submitted models for approbation to the court and corporation. The immensity of business which now devolved on the latter, both in his capacity of surveyor-general and city-architect, would have overpowered an ordinary mind; but "he prepared for his gigantic task with ardour and assiduity."

"His plan, which has been engraved, and is well known, was so arranged that the chief streets crossed each other in right lines, with smaller streets between them: the churches, public buildings, and markets, were so disposed as not to interfere with the streets; and four piazzas were designed at proper distances, into which several of the streets met." (P. 221.)

The author gives us, in the 13th paper of the Appendix, a detailed account of this beautiful plan, with a neatly executed engraving by Lowry; and then adds:

"The practicability of this whole scheme, without loss to any man, or infringement of any property, was at that time demonstrated, and all material objections fully weighed and answered; the only and, as it happened, insurmountable difficulty remaining, was the obstinate averseness of great part of the citizens to alter their old properties, and to recede from building their houses on the old ground and foundations; as also the distrust in many, and unwillingness to give up their properties, though for a time only, into the hands of public trustees, or commissioners, till they might be dispensed to them again with more advantage to themselves than otherwise was possible to be effected: for such a method was proposed, that by an equal distribution of ground into buildings, leaving our churchyards, gardens, &c. (which were to be removed out of town), there would have been sufficient room both for the augmentation of the streets, disposition of the churches, halls, and all public buildings, and to have given every proprietor full satisfaction; and although few proprietors should happen to have been seated again directly upon the very same ground they had possessed before the fire, yet no man would have been thrust any considerable distance from it, but placed at least as conveniently, and sometimes more so, to their own trades than before.

By these means, the opportunity, in a great degree, was lost, of making the new city the most magnificent as well as commodious for health and trade of any upon earth; and the surveyor being thus confined and cramped in his designs, it required no small labour and skill to model the city in the manner it has since appeared."

A despotic government would have forced these civic recusants into compliance; but while one is tempted to regret in the abstract, that a plan which united elegance and convenience to such a degree, that the British metropolis would have been unrivalled in beauty as well as magnificence, was frustrated; and to censure those individual instances of churlishness, covetousness, or selfishness, which doubtless increased the sum of opposition; yet in the opposition itself was mixed that element of the English character, which is connected with the popular part of the national constitution. A remembrance of this connexion serves to reconcile the modern tradesman, jealous of his rights, to the perverseness of his ancestor, as he sits down by his domestic hearth, after an unavoidable circuit through crooked streets and winding alleys, or a visit to two districts in opposite points of the compass, to produce a result which would have been effected by a single journey, on the regulations of Sir Christopher Wren.

The theatre at Oxford was opened with great ceremony, July 9, 1669, on which occasion, Archbishop Sheldon presented the architect with a golden cup. The Royal Exchange, which had been rebuilt from his design, and under his superintendence, was fit for business on the following September; about which time Temple Bar was commenced; which was succeeded by the great Doric fluted column, on Fish Street Hill, called "The Monument," and destined to be the subject of much political remark, into which we cannot enter. It was seven years in building, owing to the difficulty of procuring the best Portland stone, and other hindrances of a local nature. Having been reared in commemoration of the fire, and attributing that catastrophe to papists, it has been wittily described as recording an event which will never be forgotten, and perpetuating a falsehood which will never be believed. It is the noblest modern column in the world, and will bear a comparison with any pillar of antiquity; greatly exceeding in height those of the Emperors Trajan and Antoninus at Rome, or that of Theodosius at Constantinople. Wren wished to have a brazen statue of Charles II. fifteen feet high, placed on the top, which would have suited the grandeur of the pillar, and been a suitable object. In default of which he recommended a ball of copper, nine feet diameter. The committee of management

however overruled both proposals, and substituted a flaming vase, which is both inelegant in itself, and has a bad effect at a distance. Wren composed a beautiful and comprehensive inscription to be cut on its pedestal; and Adam Littleton, author of the well known Latin dictionary, another, which was more affected and pedantic; but they were rejected for one of more common-place character.

In 1671, he began his singular and incomparable production, the spire of St. Mary-le-Bow, in Cheapside; which is thus characterized by our author:—

“This beautiful steeple, like all of Wren’s, commences from the ground; unlike many of his tasteless successors, who place them on the apex of a weak pediment. It stands at the north-west angle of the church, and rises nearly plain to a height above the houses. The doors, on the external sides, are enclosed in rusticated niches: the dressings of the door-ways are of the Palladian Doric, embellished with cherubim and festoons. The clock projects into the street, on the north side, and is a handsome as well as a highly useful embellishment to the tower; which is surmounted by a block cornice and well-proportioned balustrade. Each angle is relieved by a pyramidal group of bold scrolls, supporting a vase; between which rises a lofty circular stylobate, or continued pedestal, which supports a beautiful circular temple of the Corinthian order; the cell of which supports the upper part of the spire, while it beautifully relieves the columns of the peristyle, as an ever varying back-ground. This temple is likewise surmounted by a balustrade, from whence spring a series of beautifully proportioned and elegantly carved flying buttresses, of a highly original shape and construction. These elevate and magically support another temple, of a simpler species of the Corinthian order, forming four porticoes of two columns each, the entablature breaking fancifully over them. The whole is surmounted by a very elegant obelisk or spire, supporting a colossal vane, in the semblance of a dragon, of copper gilt, and with a red cross under each wing, the emblem of the city.” (Pp. 297, 298.)

We subscribe to all that Mr. Elmes can say by way of eulogy on its beauty and scientific construction, but we would give a different reading concerning the clock, and call it “a highly useful disfigurement;” and as to the “fiery flying serpent,” which he denominates a “beautiful vane,” in a sentence immediately succeeding the above quotation, our associations with regard to dragons, *et genus hoc omne*, are of such a nature, that we should think this monster would have better adorned a Chinese pagoda, than a Christian temple; not to add, that its size is disproportionate to the light and taper spire, on which it seems in the midst of its flight to have pitched in profane impertinence. Ward, in his London spy, has a sarcasm on this ornament, alluding to the disputes about

Sacheverell: "But pray, said I, what is the meaning of this terrible monster upon the top, instead of a fane or weather-cock? Why that, says my friend, is a brazen dragon, exalted as an emblem of the church persecution!" Our author has given us, however, in a note, an entertaining anecdote concerning it.

"This immense vane was lowered from its place, under the direction of Mr. A. Elmes, of College-hill, on Michaelmas day, 1820: an adventurous young Irishman, of the name of Michael Burke, descended on its back from its situation, 225 feet from the ground, pushing it from the scaffolds and cornices with his feet, in the presence of thousands of spectators. When it was before lowered by Sir William Staines, the worthy baronet, then a young stone-mason, was mounted on its back, on a low four-wheeled carriage in Cheapside, and drawn to the city stone-yard by his men."

St. Stephen's Walbrook, is considered by many to be Wren's master-piece, and superior to any edifice of the kind in Italy for proportionate design and elegant construction. Mr. Elmes observes—

"The beauty of the interior of this church arises from its lightness and elegance. On entering from the street, by about a dozen or more of steps, through a vestibule of dubious obscurity, on opening the handsome folding wainscot doors, a halo of dazzling light flashes at once upon the eye; and a lovely band of Corinthian columns, of beauteous proportions, appear in magic mazes before you. The expansive cupola, and supporting arches, expand their airy shapes like gossamer; and the sweetly proportioned embellished architrave cornice, of original lightness and application, completes the charm. On a second look, the columns slide into complete order, like a band of young and elegant dancers, at the close of a quadrille. Then the pedestals, concealed by the elaborate pewings, which are sculptured into the form of a solid stylobate, opening up the nave, under the cupola, to the great recess which contains the altar, and West's fine historical picture of the stoning of St. Stephen, lift up the entire column to the level of the eye: their brown and brawny solids supporting the delicate white forms of the entire order. The composition of the order, the arrangement of the parts, the effect of the whole; exhibit the originality of Wren's mind in a captivating point of view; and its excellencies, like Aaron's rod, swallow up the trivial faults of the detail. He who doubts the excellencies of Wren, as an architect of the first order, should deeply study this jewel of the art—find fault, if he can; but first qualify himself, by trying to surpass it." (P. 315.)

We are sorry that we cannot pass over this piece of criticism without protesting against the false taste in which it is composed. Where could our author have learned such a *petit-maitre* and fantastical style of description? Not to say how badly the optical effect of the light from the lantern is represented by "a halo of dazzling light flashing at once upon

the eye ;" who could have thought of the arches, "expanding their airy shapes *like gossamer?*" or the columns resembling a set of young ladies and gentlemen falling into their places "*at the close of a quadrille?*" But moreover, "*the brown and braunny solids* of the pedestals support the *delicate white forms* of the entire order," as you see Satyrs lifting Nymphs in an Italian painting ! And after all, comes Aaron's rod, to swallow up all faults !

We turn for relief to another page of the narrative, containing some interesting matter.

1673. "It has been seen that the surveyor-general made no communication to the Royal Society this year ; and only attended once (in December) after being elected on the council. His increased occupations demanded all his leisure ; and speculative philosophy was obliged to give way to executive operations. In addition to this necessary, and no doubt painful secession from the friends of his youth and mature manhood, he resigned on April 9, his Savillian professor's chair, in the University of Oxford, which he had held with honour to himself, and with satisfaction to the great officers of the University, and his numerous pupils.

"St. Paul's was now the great object of attention to the whole nation, from the king downwards. The intention of repairing the old edifice was abandoned ? and the architect was desired to make designs for an entirely new edifice, worthy the honour of the country, and calculated to rival every edifice of its kind in Europe.

"Wren therefore prepared various designs, for the inspection of the king, and the commissioners for the rebuilding. One being selected, his majesty ordered a model in wood, on a large scale, to be made ; which is now in a neglected and dilapidated state, in an apartment over the morning prayer chapel at St. Paul's. To give an idea of this plan, which is said, and with great probability, to have been a favourite with its architect, I have given a plate, taken from actual measurement last summer. It is said to have been rejected on account of its differing so much from the generally received notions of cathedral churches ; having no aisles, with naves, which were required in the ceremonies of the church of Rome, by whose adherents they were built. Spence in his anecdotes says, on the authority of Mr. Harding, that the side oratories were added by the influence of the Duke of York and his party, who wished to have them ready for his intended revival of the popish service. He adds, that 'it narrowed the building, and broke in very much upon the beauty of the design. Sir Christopher insisted so strongly on the prejudice they would be of, that he actually shed tears in speaking of it ; but it was all in vain. The Duke absolutely insisted on their being inserted, and he was obliged to comply.' " (P. 319.)

In removing the old fabric, Sir Christopher used gunpowder in judicious quantities to expedite his operations ; but



being called into the country on his duty to the king, he left the management of a mine to another person, who neglected some necessary precautions, and in the explosion a fragment of stone was shot into a private house, which alarmed the neighbourhood, and he was forced to resort afterwards to the slower process of the battering ram. The first stone of the new cathedral was laid on June 21, 1675.

We must not omit to notice the erection of St. James's Church, Piccadilly, in 1683, which the architect thought one of the best contrived of his sacred buildings. The author has given us a section of this edifice, from a drawing by Mr. Cockerell, by which it appears that the construction of the roof is singularly ingenious and economical both of room and of materials. This church is remarkably well adapted for the purposes of seeing and hearing the officiating ministers, and is much esteemed by professional men. A neat section and elevation of the theatre of the College of Physicians is also furnished by Mr. Cockerell. Of this building our author observes—

“It is a perfect study of acoustical and optical architecture: the roof and form of the section being so well adapted for the distribution of sound, and the elevation and arrangement of the seats, with the president's chair in the centre, and the separate stairs for the fellows and students so well designed. This admirable structure being shortly to be pulled down, it is worth the inspection of the scientific architect, before it is destroyed.” (P. 451.)

Sir Christopher did not, however, quite neglect his philosophical and anatomical studies, while so deeply engaged in architectural pursuits. He was elected President of the Royal Society, but found the office incompatible with his other engagements, and resumed his seat in the council. In 1689 he was returned burgess for New Windsor in the parliament that sat after the abdication of King James, but was removed by petition on account of an informality in the election. He was, however, re-elected, and the house negativing their former resolution, he continued the sitting member. In 1700 the same honour was conferred on him by the borough of Weymouth. The author has not given us much information of Wren's religious and moral character. It is known, however, that he was devout in his habits, decorous in his manners, and placid in his temper. Our readers will be gratified to learn, that when St. Paul's was building, he put up a printed notice, that every workman who was heard to swear should be dismissed, and every master, who did not reprove his labourers for such a custom, should be reprimanded. It pleased God

to spare his life till the completion of his great work, and on the second of December, 1696, the choir of the new cathedral was opened for divine service, on the thanksgiving day for the peace of Ryswick, when an appropriate prayer was used, which might serve as a model for these occasional additions to the worship of our church. At the age of ninety-one, as he was taking his accustomed nap after dinner, on the 25th of February, 1723, he serenely breathed his last, being found by his servant dead in his chair. \*

We are obliged to Mr. Elmes for this biography of our great countryman, and for taking away our reproach of the want of a specific narrative of the man, of whom Walpole neatly observes, "A variety of knowledge proclaims the universality, a multiplicity of works the abundance, St. Paul's the greatness of Sir Christopher's genius." We must however add, that our expectation has been much disappointed, both in the matter and manner of his work. The Life should have been composed in three parts—private, professional, and philosophical; and for this more extended labour the writer was well provided with documents collected during fifteen years, which a little industry would have enabled him to put together into a more pleasing form. As it is, the attention of the reader is continually drawn from the rearing of a palace to the construction of a mathematical instrument, or from the discussion of a question of taste, to an appeal about a common sewer. There is a heaviness also which pervades the composition, and is seldom relieved by more spirited writing: the author is not happy in his comparisons, and has lost many fair opportunities of remarking on the distinctive character of Wren's genius, and of a professional taste that was formed without a visit to Greece or Italy. The work is moreover so carelessly written, that we have the same verbs or nouns repeated five or six times in almost as many sentences. One of its greatest merits is the parallelism sustained between the actions of its subject, and the events of his day, together with the valuable information respecting other eminent characters, both in the text and the notes. It is embellished with a good engraving of the architect, by Scriven, from the portrait by Kneller. But we cannot take leave of the work without observing, that another monument should be reared to his memory; and that we agree with his biographer in the sentiment, that "the debt due from his country will never be paid, till parliament vote a sum of public money to erect a statue to the man who so enriched it by his works."

ART. IV.—*Observations on the Religious Peculiarities of the Society of Friends.* By Joseph John Gurney. Second Edition. 8vo. pp. 368. London: Arch, Cornhill. 1824.

IN entering upon the examination of the present work, we wish at once to remove any uncertainty, as to our opinion of its contents. In common with the Christian world, we respect the society of which Mr. Gurney is a member: and perhaps many, who are unacquainted with their peculiar tenets, may think that the differences between them and the general church, may in part arise from our not understanding them, and from their not understanding us. Such views, however, the work before us is calculated entirely to set aside. Its tone is mild, but in its matter it is substantially opposed to our views. Its sentiments, we conceive, are such, that any one who is sound in the faith, as it is held by the universal Church of Christ, must reject them at once. And if there be any disposition to listen to them with favour, it can only be on the part of those, who are very unsettled in some of the leading points of doctrine and practice, which are generally received amongst us. The present, then, we conceive to be an occasion, where the language of compromise,—the language of liberality as it is commonly called,—would be totally misplaced. The work of Mr. Gurney puts us on our defence. His primary object, very probably, has been, only to set forth and advocate his own principles. But in doing this, he, very temperately but very explicitly, suaviter in modo, but fortiter in re, assails many of the leading truths which most Christians hold in common: and therefore on no other footing than as an opponent can we now consent to meet him. In saying that we respect the community to which he belongs, we are only expressing a feeling, general among Christians of every denomination. In saying that there is a tone in many parts of his work, which we cannot but commend, we shall have the consent of all who have perused it. But we could not say that we approve, or even view with indifference, the peculiar system of doctrine and practice which his work maintains, without compromising principles that to us appear essential.

A cursory reader will be struck, perhaps, in the first place, with the attempts, far too frequently occurring in the present work, to improve the received version of the Scriptures. Wherever we meet with many of these attempts, we regard

it as an unfavourable sign : not that we are the enemies of free discussion, or imagine that our authorized version partakes of the infallibility of the original ; but because we have so generally found a disposition to tamper with it, connected with false or anomalous views of religious truth. The reader will also feel surprised, perhaps, when he learns who is one of Mr. Gurney's most approved commentators : " Rosenmüller, one of the most able and impartial of modern biblical critics ! " p. 111.—Our author's views on the subject of the moral law, also, have somewhat of a portentous character.—And we mention the subject now, before we proceed with details, because his sentiments on this subject lie scattered through his work. The general notion of Christians is, that the law was given by Moses, in all its perfection, purity, and spirituality ; and sanctioned, confirmed, and illustrated, but by no means altered, improved, or added to, the supposition being contrary to its very nature,—by Jesus Christ. It is no objection to this view of the moral law, that the civil law of the Israelites permitted some things which were contrary to its spirit, such as divorce upon trifling pretences ; and that our Saviour, in conformity with the moral law, afterwards withdrew this permission. The Mosaic regulation, upon the subject of divorce, was altogether a judicial regulation. The moral law was immutable ; and was " given by Moses," once for all. That particular faith, of which the object is the person, performances, and sufferings of Jesus Christ, does not make void the moral law, but establishes it as a rule of life. And Christ came not to amend, but to fulfil and maintain it.

Such, we conceive, is the view of the general Church upon this subject ; but such is not the view of Mr. Gurney. His idea is, that a perfect law was first given by Christ. He conceives that Christ "*promulgated* a perfect code of practical morality." p. 353. And accordingly he speaks of " the moral law, *as revealed under the Christian dispensation.*" p. 293. This second law, it appears, was something purer than any that had been given before. Hence we are told of " the purer morality of that system of religion, of which the law, with all its accompaniments, was only the introduction." p. 272. And accordingly, the former law was something inferior. As to John the Baptist, " His moral system was that of the law." p. 272. We might add, And so was Christ's : and the perfect righteousness of Christ, in which penitent believers hope, and in which they stand invested before God, consists in Christ's having fully performed the law.—The views of Mr. Gurney are particularly developed

by him, with reference to the principle of retaliation. "The law of Moses sanctioned the principle of retaliation, Exod. xxi. 23—25; Numb. xxxi. 17—21." p. 253. This opinion, however, will not be found to be borne out by the passages referred to. "And if any mischief follow, then thou shalt give life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe." This however is retribution, not retaliation. It does not say, 'Thou shalt *take* life for life, eye for eye, &c. but, "Thou shalt *give*." This then is a judicial regulation. It was the judge that was to give, or assign, the due measure of punishment, in the course of public justice. We acknowledge no sanction, then, of the law of retaliation here.—The other passage relates to the destruction of the Midianites, which was enjoined in consequence of their having tempted the Israelites to commit sin. Here again we have a case, not of retaliation but of retribution. Retaliation would have been, to tempt the Midianites to commit sin. As to what Mr. Gurney afterwards advances, namely, that "the principle of the law of Moses was love to friends and hatred of enemies," (Page 253,) he appears to ground this opinion on a supposition that, by the words, "Ye have heard that it hath been said, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy,'" our Saviour meant to intimate, that this had been said in conformity with the law. But the point is one which we are by no means prepared to grant. It has been well suggested, that the scribes finding in the law, the words, "thou shalt love thy neighbour," added probably, "and hate thine enemy," as a gloss of their own. We know that they did not find this precept in the Pentateuch. Our own conjecture, however, is, that the saying had its origin in the words of Joab to David, "Thou hast shamed, this day, the faces of all thy servants, . . . in that thou lovest thine enemies, and hatest thy friends," 2 Sam. xix. 5, 6. Joab having reproved David in these terms, and David having acted upon the reproof, the Jews might naturally convert the reproof into a precept; and say commonly among themselves, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy." But it by no means follows, that the latter part of this precept was in accordance with the moral law.

We have entered into these particulars, not as contending for a point which the majority of our readers will feel any difficulty in admitting, but in order to shew, in the outset, that the principles maintained in the present work, are not distinguished from those of the general Church merely by slight shades of difference, but by a broad line. This, how-

ever, will be even more clearly seen, as we proceed to offer a few remarks, in order, upon some of the various topics contained in the work. We wish to do this in the spirit of Christian charity; but not in the spirit of concession or compromise, which, we are convinced, the case forbids.

Before proceeding to state the peculiar footing of the Society of Friends, with reference to other communions, Mr. Gurney treats in his first chapter, "on the grounds of religious union which subsist among mankind in general, and more especially among true Christians." Even in this preliminary discussion, some peculiar opinions are advanced. The following positions are considered in order.

"God is the Creator and merciful Father of us all. Christ died for us all. A measure of the influence of the Holy Spirit enlightens, and, if obeyed, would save us all." (P. 2.)

And in the discussion of these topics, the author goes so far as to infer,

"that the outward knowledge of Christ is not absolutely indispensable to salvation, and that persons who are *altogether destitute* of that knowledge, may be saved from sin and from the penalties which are attached to it, through the secret operations of divine grace." (P. 7.)

This is by far too precipitate an inference, upon a difficult question, in which we have, personally, no concern. Scripture, on the contrary, makes known to us no way of salvation, except by the name of "Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph:" and not only no way except by his name, but no way, except by "his name, through faith in his name;—yea, the faith which is by him." St. Paul, accordingly, so far from holding out to us a hope of so indefinite a kind, says "*Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved:*" and adds; "How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach, except they be sent?"—shewing us that the whole detail and process of evangelization is necessary; or how shall men call on the name of the Lord and be saved? With regard to the opinion, that a measure of the influence of the Spirit is bestowed upon *all men*, by which they are enlightened, and by which they may be saved, it is completely set aside by the character of those separatists whom St. Jude describes, as "sensual, having *not* the Spirit:" nor did our Saviour afford it greater support, when he said to the Jews, "I know you, that ye have not the love of God in you." Nay, so far from its being true, that the world in general partake of the influence of the Spirit, we learn from our Saviour's words, that this *cannot* be. "I will pray the

Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, . . . even the Spirit of Truth, whom the world CANNOT receive." Surely, then, Mr. Gurney has not taken the necessary time to consider, when he says,

"I consider there is nothing in the way to prevent our coming to a sound conclusion, that . . . all men have received a measure of that spiritual influence, through which alone they can permanently enjoy the mercy of God, or participate in the benefits of the death of Christ." (P. 15.)

Surely, we say, it is rather a hasty conclusion, that all men have received that, which, our Lord himself tells us, the world cannot receive.

We might ask indeed, if this declaration from our Lord himself did not set the question at rest, how it comes to pass, that, among so many who have received this inward communication, there are so few who receive the outward communication of the gospel of Christ, when it is preached to them. Well indeed was it observed by the ancient Simeon, that the child Jesus was come into the world, "that the thoughts of many hearts might be revealed." The preaching of Jesus Christ, too plainly reveals what is in the hearts of men. That preaching is met, on their parts, not by a cordial welcome, as it would be if they had already the inward influence of the Holy Spirit, for, as Christ himself says, "My sheep hear my voice:" but by indifference, aversion, and disgust; tokens, too plain to be misunderstood, of a far different spirit. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God." And that circumstance of itself is proof sufficient of his not having the Spirit: for those things, as the apostle goes on to say, "are spiritually discerned." Those who have the Spirit will not reject, then, as many do; they will *receive* the things of the Spirit.

There are some expressions in this first chapter, which, as well as the opinions advanced in it, bear marks of haste. Thus, at page 7, it is stated, that

"Between the effects of Adam's sin and those of the obedience of Christ, there is, in various respects, a perfect coincidence."!

The author means, probably, a perfect contrast: the effects of the two being in some measure antithetic, or relatively opposite. Referring to the same subject, he goes on to say, "It appears to have been provided by the mercy and *equity* of God, that, in both the *extent* and *manner* of their operation, the analogy should be preserved between the disease and the remedy."

We can discern, indeed, the *mercy* of God, in providing a remedy for the disease. But, we conceive, there was no claim on his *equity*. The author is speaking, probably, with refer-

ence to that equality, which he supposes. But his mode of expressing himself, unless properly understood, might lead to very serious error.

In the second chapter, the author treats of "Religious peculiarities"; with "general observations on those of the Society of Friends." In the course of this chapter, an idea is suggested, which often appears in the present work; namely, that there may be some *benefit* in the existing differences of the religious world.

"It can scarcely be denied, (says Mr. Gurney,) that in that variety of administration, through which the saving principles of religion are for the present permitted to pass, there is much of a real adaptation to a corresponding variety of mental condition." (P. 30.)

We are aware that the same idea is carried by others to far greater length. But our own conviction of the importance of religious unity is so strong, that we find it difficult to regard any existing differences of opinion, however they may be overruled for good, as good in themselves. Some persons, it appears, view the peculiarities of the Society to which Mr. Gurney belongs, with a favourable eye, though they do not adopt them. This is a strange inconsistency at best.

"There are, I believe, few persons accustomed to a comprehensive view of the whole militant church, and of the course which true religion is taking among mankind, who will be disposed to deny that the situation occupied in the body by the society of Friends, is one of considerable importance to the cause of righteousness. My own observation has indeed led me to form the conclusion, that there are some spiritually-minded persons, not immediately connected with Friends, who go still farther, and who even *rejoice* in the consideration, that, among the various classes of the Christian church, there is numbered one fraternity who bear a plain and decisive testimony against warfare in all its forms—against oaths under any pretext—and against all hiring or paying of the ministers of the gospel: a fraternity whose practice and history afford a sufficient evidence that God *may* be acceptably and profitably worshipped, without the intervention of a single typical ceremony, and without the necessary or constant aid of any human ministry. However such persons may differ from us in the precise view of these very subjects, they appear to be aware that the tendency of our peculiarities is good, and they will allow that Christianity in its progress through the world may derive no trifling advantage from the circumstance, that these religious principles are, by *some* at least among the followers of Jesus, plainly and resolutely upheld." (Pp. 33, 34.)

We can only say, such persons must be very lame reasoners.

Chapter the third relates to "the perceptible influence and guidance of the Spirit of Truth." On this subject Mr. Gurney offers the following statement.



"Some persons conceive that the Spirit of God does not influence the heart of man *directly*, but only through the means of certain appointed instruments; such as the Holy Scriptures, and the word preached. Many others, who allow the direct and independent influences of the Spirit, and deem them absolutely essential to the formation of the christian character, refuse to admit that they are perceptible to the mind, but consider them to be hidden in their action and revealed only in their fruits. Now with Friends (and I believe with very many persons not so denominated) it is a leading principle in religion—a principle on which they deem it to be in a particular manner their duty to insist—that the operations of the Holy Spirit in the soul are not only immediate and direct, but perceptible; and that we are all furnished with an inward Guide or Monitor who makes his voice known to us, and who, if faithfully obeyed and closely followed, will infallibly conduct us into true virtue and happiness, because he leads us into a real conformity with the will of God." (P. 37.)

His community, then, it appears, regard the influences of the Spirit, first, as "immediate and direct," secondly, as "perceptible." On each of these topics we shall offer a few remarks.

In maintaining that the influences of the Spirit are immediate or direct, it is meant, as we understand our author, that they are not communicated to us through the means of appointed instruments, as the preached and written word. They are, as he fully explains himself, in *accordance* with the word of God; but they come to us in a manner entirely independent of that channel. Now we cannot, on the contrary, but regard the word of God, as the usual instrument of the Spirit's communications. Accordingly, we are taught by the apostle, to take "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God." (Eph. vi. 17.) The same thing is intimated in the Apocalypse, where the word of the Lord is represented as a sword that proceeded out of his mouth. The word of Christ, also, is represented as the grand instrument in the sanctification of his Church, in the Epistle to the Ephesians; where we are told that Christ "loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water *by the word*." (v. 25, 26.)—When Christ promised the Holy Ghost to his disciples, as a Comforter who should "guide them into all truth;" it is clear from the very passages which Mr. Gurney quotes, (page 41,) that this guidance was mainly to be effected through the instrumentality of the word. "He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, *whatsoever I have said unto you*." John xiv. 26. Nay, the idea of any independent teaching on the part of the Holy Spirit, is entirely *set aside* by our Saviour's

words, in one of the very passages which Mr. Gurney quotes. "He shall not speak of himself; but *whatsoever he shall hear*, that shall he speak." John xvi. 13. What teaching, then, can the Holy Spirit have for us, except the word of God? To this quarter, and to this alone, are we to look for light. For "the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." 1 Pet. i. 25.

Accordingly, how was it that our Lord taught his disciples, after his resurrection? "Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the *scriptures*," Luke xxiv. 45. How does the sacred writer describe their ignorance, previous to this instruction? "As yet they knew not the *scripture*," John xx. 9. In other places, when spiritual blessings are spoken of, we find, on examination, it was through the scriptures that those spiritual blessings were to be conveyed. Thus the apostle prays, "Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, through the power of the Holy Ghost," Rom. xv. 13. Here, then, blessings are invoked, "through the power of the Holy Ghost." But was the operation of the Holy Ghost, by which these blessings should be conveyed, to be independent of the scriptures? No: for, a few verses before, the apostle says, "Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning; that we, *through patience and comfort of the scriptures*, might have hope," ver. 4. Hope is spoken of in both these passages. In the former, hope is sought for, "*through the power of the Holy Ghost*." In the latter, we are taught to look for hope, "*through patience and comfort of the scriptures*." Thus, we trace a connexion between the two.

And the usual mode of the Spirit's teaching, we believe, is still the same. It is, as a well-known writer has expressed it, 'the light of the Spirit of God, shining on the word of God: ' the Holy Ghost teaching the people of God, not only according to, but by the scriptures. "The Sower soweth *the word*." It is in the consideration of some text of scripture, that eternal truth, contained in that text, opens upon our minds, under the teaching of the Spirit. It is, perhaps, in comparing scripture with scripture. It may be even, less observably, by some scriptural truth, laid up in the memory like seed in the ground; but not germinating, till called into life by the Spirit's power. And we are strongly inclined to think, even in the experience of our esteemed Friends, and that, when they are most unconscious of the fact, and conceive the influence of the Spirit upon their minds to possess

most unequivocally the character of a direct communication, that some scriptural text, some scriptural idea, or at the very least some scriptural impression, is mainly concerned, supposing that they are not altogether under a delusion, in the impulse conveyed to them. Far be it from us to presume to say, that the Spirit *cannot* teach us except through the instrumentality of the word; or even that, in some instances, he does not; as, for example, in the case of those believers, whose outward means of instruction are unusually limited. But it will be a fallacy, if from rare cases of this kind, we draw any inference with respect to the case of those believers who have every opportunity of instruction. "To the law and to the testimony" must be their rule. And it is in looking to that quarter alone that they must expect light. And to us it has always appeared, that wherever there has been less regard to the written word, and less acquaintance with it, and less of a habit of seeking spiritual direction from and through it, as an ultimate resort from which there is no appeal, there the religious fabric has possessed less of a solid, more of an unsettled character: the doctrine may have been high, but the foundation has been narrow and weak; and the whole edifice has appeared to totter, for want of any sure support to rest upon. And, on the contrary, where a person has appeared to have gone but a little way in religion, if he has gone with scripture for his guide, the word being applied to his heart with power, that person, we shall find, has very great advantages. When Apollos came to Ephesus, he knew only the baptism of John: yet, being mighty in the scriptures, he was enabled by the Spirit to speak boldly in the synagogue. Afterwards, Aquila and Priscilla expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly. The word preached, as well as the word written, was now employed to teach him. Thus doubly prepared, he passed into Achaia; where, though but a novice, being mighty in the scriptures, he helped them much which had believed through grace. And, for the same reason, he mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly. His knowledge of the scriptures appears, throughout, to have been concerned both in his proficiency and in his usefulness: for "he mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly, shewing BY THE SCRIPTURES that Jesus was Christ."

But while we maintain that the *usual* mode of the Spirit's teaching, is through the instrumentality of the word, we also allege that the word is an *adequate* or *sufficient* instrument. Scripture, as the Apostle says, is "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness."

He means, it is profitable for every thing. And wherefore does he signify this? His intention is evident from the following verse: "that the man of God may be *perfect, thoroughly furnished* unto all good works." If then, by means of the scriptures, we may be thus *thoroughly* furnished, with what shew of reason shall we allege any independent mode of spiritual instruction? Where is the need of it? Is it not to be feared that we have but defective views of the sufficiency and adequacy of the holy scriptures? Indeed, this certainly appears to be the case with Mr. Gurney: for instance, where he says,

"The law written in the book, and the law written in the heart, have proceeded from the same Author: the only standard of both these laws is the will of God; and the former corresponds with the latter, as the image in the mirror corresponds with its original. It ought, however, to be remarked that the written law, for the most part, consists in *general directions*. Now the inward manifestations of the Spirit of Christ, while they confirm the principles on which those general directions are founded, will instruct us how to apply them in our daily walk, and under all the various circumstances and exigencies of life. For example, the outward law declares, "thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." The inward law will not only inculcate the same rule, but will point out to the obedient followers of Christ, in what manner, and on what occasions, this love is to be brought into action." (P. 54.)

As a proof of his assertion, that the written law for the most part consists in *general directions*, we think he could not have selected a more unsuitable example than the law of charity. For what can be more full, more particular, more comprehensive, more minute, than the language of scripture on this subject? As to what is here said of the inward law, that it "will point out," to Christians, in what manner, and on what occasions, the written law is to be brought into action, we apprehend that the inward law will point out nothing to us, but what is *in* the written law. And it appears to us "a most dangerous downfall," and pregnant with abuse, to imagine that there is any inward law, independent of the rule of scripture, which, if we may say so, is to regulate that rule, and make us judges of it, and tell us in what manner, and on what occasion, it is to be brought into action. Alas, we do indeed too often feel an inward law, which constantly aspires to exercise this influence over our minds, and to tell us how far we shall and how far we shall not follow scripture. But we know, from sad experience, that this law cometh not down from above; but is the natural produce of our hearts, apostate and alienated from that good, and ac-

ceptable, and perfect will of God, which the written law declares.

The Bible is an inexhaustible mine of unexplored riches. The church of Christ maintains, and, though the above passage seems to insinuate as much, we do not think Mr. Gurney will absolutely maintain the contrary, that holy scripture is a perfect rule, and contains all things necessary for man's salvation. Is it likely then, that the Almighty would appoint, for our learning, an instrument so fully sufficient and adequate, put it into our hands, and then teach us without it? If, in our own experience, an instrument of this kind *appear* to be insufficient, the fault must lie in ourselves. And if, through this fault of our own, we persist in regarding the appointed means as defective, it will be well for us if in the end we only fall into "religious peculiarities," which our more sober brethren can pardon though they do not approve: it may happen that we shall fall into very serious errors, or even total apostacy.

The other opinion now to be considered is, that the operations of the Holy Spirit in the soul are *perceptible*. On the contrary, the more usual language of the church is, that they are only discernible by their effects. Here, however, it is important to observe, that we mean, amongst others, their *inward* effects: love, joy, peace, faith, hope, meekness, and the like; as well as the outward effects of a holy and religious life. Now we imagine, that what Friends perceive, are in fact only the inward *effects* of the Spirit's operations, after all; not, as they tell us, the operations themselves. For instance, there may be a strong, impelling sense of duty. This is the *effect* of the Spirit's operation: and oftener than they are aware, perhaps, as we have already suggested, it is conveyed by the Spirit to the mind, through the instrumentality of some scriptural passage, idea, or impression. Now if that which is made perceptible to them be the inward *effect*, only, of the Spirit's operation; then, we conceive, their experience does not materially differ from the experience of Christians in general.

To imagine, however, that, because the inward effects of the Spirit's operations are perceptible, those operations are themselves perceptible, is a very common error. And we think there are some traces, sufficiently obvious, of this fallacy, in the work now before us. Thus, respecting that text, in which Christ is styled "the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world," Mr. Gurney observes—

"Now it is certain that nothing can justly be denominated *light*, which does not *make manifest*. 'All things that are reprov'd,' says

the apostle Paul, 'are made manifest by the light, for *whatsoever doth make manifest is light*;' Eph. v. 13. Since then Christ, or the Spirit of Christ, in those operations which are altogether internal and independent of an outward revelation, is *light*, it is plain that this Spirit in such inward operations *makes manifest*—communicates an actual moral sense—teaches what is right and what is wrong, in a perceptible or intelligible manner." (P. 38.)

Here the fallacy is obvious. Christ makes manifest: therefore, he makes *himself* manifest. Again—

"If then there be given to us an internal communication of the Spirit of truth by which we are to be *led*, it is surely very plain that such communication must be made manifest to our mental perception, or otherwise we could not follow it." (Pp. 39, 40.)

Far from it. If the leading be made manifest, nothing more is necessary.

Now here it may seem, that we are pausing to split a hair. But peculiar views, upon points on which the voice of the general Church is agreed, are seldom unattended with substantial mischief. The true state of the case we conceive to be this: that, the Holy Ghost acting upon the inner man by influencing the mind, his inward operations become manifest, only in the operations of the mind itself. He acts, for instance, on the will, and the will chooses what before it disliked, or rejects what before it loved. He acts upon the affections, and, in the same measure in which he acts, the affections are regulated and purified. Hence it follows, that the true token of the Spirit's agency, is not the perception of something acting on the mind, but the perception of a change in the mind itself. The proud mind becomes humble; the angry mind becomes gentle; in a word, the carnal mind becomes spiritual. Now, what, on the contrary, will be the state of the case, if the operation of the Spirit be perceptible? It will then be no longer an operation in the mind; but an operation, from without, upon the mind. The mind will continue the same; the will, the affections, the same. The Spirit only acts on them, not in and with them. Mark then the consequences to which this view of the subject leads. Whatever portion of the Spirit's operations may be assigned to us, there will be no change of heart, no new nature, no renovation of the inner man. We shall be acted on, influenced, nay, perceptibly directed:—but we shall die unregenerate!

"We are all furnished," Mr. Gurney thinks, "with an inward Guide or Monitor who makes his voice known to us, and who, if faithfully obeyed and closely followed, will infallibly conduct us into true virtue and happiness, because he leads us into a real conformity with the will of God." (P. 37.)

And such is the language which he holds throughout. But the truth is, we want something more than this. We want, not merely a Guide who will infallibly conduct us right, "*if*" we faithfully obey and closely follow him; but an inward influence, which, operating in and with our wills, shall so constrain and rule our hearts, as to *cause* us to obey and follow with a ready mind. The "*if*" leaves us without security, without hope.

Hence, too, by this doctrine of a perceptible operation of the Holy Spirit, (it appears a high doctrine, but in fact it is a very low one,) we are also led to another dangerous inference: namely, that it rests with ourselves, in order to receive this influence, to bring ourselves into the requisite frame of mind. The work of the Spirit upon the mind being perceptible, and therefore external, the internal work must of necessity be our own. A frequent, though probably an unconscious tendency to this inference, is very observable in Mr. Gurney's book. Thus in the present chapter he says,

"When the pride of the heart is laid low, when the activity of human reasoning is quieted, when the soul is reduced to a state of silent subjection in the presence of its Creator, then is this 'still small voice' intelligibly heard, and the word of the Lord as it is inwardly revealed to us, becomes 'a lamp' unto our 'feet' and a 'light' unto our 'paths.'" (P. 46.)

By the bye, *we* had always understood the Psalmist, by the "*word*" of the Lord, in the text here referred to, which was a lamp unto his feet and a light unto his path, to mean the Pentateuch, and the other portions of the canonical Scriptures then in existence; the written word: not the word "*inwardly revealed*." It will be seen, however, with what view we offer the above extract: namely, as it illustrates our observation, that the idea of a perceptible influence of the Spirit naturally leads to the notion of self-preparation, in order that we may receive that influence. Our pride must be laid low, our reasoning quieted, our soul reduced to subjection, and *then* the still small voice will be heard. But we say as before,—we want something antecedent:—we cannot make this preparation of ourselves. We must have the divine aid, in those very things wherein the preparation consists, or the time when we are prepared will never come. Therefore we need the *inward* operation of the Spirit; and if inward, then not perceptible, except in its effects. It will be readily understood what we mean by the word *inward*. Mr. Gurney himself speaks of an "*inward Guide*," and of "*the word of the Lord as it is inwardly revealed to us*." But the guidance and the revelation to which he refers, are in reality,

as far as the mind is concerned, external. They come upon it from without. Their voice is heard by it, as we understand Mr. Gurney, precisely as the voice of a person speaking to us is heard with our outward ears. Now what we want, and what the Scripture teaches us to seek, is not a voice speaking *to* our minds, nor an influence acting *upon* our minds—but that transforming, regenerating, assimilating power of the Holy Ghost, which acts in and with our minds, so that the tokens of its acting shall appear in the new nature and operations of the mind itself. The influence of which Mr. Gurney speaks, if indeed, in the experience of Christians at the present day, there be really any thing of the kind, may be a sign, may be an impulse, may be a communication; but it is not that renovating and sanctifying power by which the new man is, after God, created and advanced in righteousness and true holiness, and so made meet to be partaker of the inheritance of the saints in light. And the danger is, if, in looking for the outward influence, we neglect that which is of greater importance, and should be first sought, the inward change.

The fourth chapter is entitled, “On the disuse of all typical rites in the worship of God:” and has a particular reference to the rites of Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, which Quakers reject. The limits of a review forbid our following Mr. Gurney through all the details of his argument upon these topics. We must content ourselves, therefore, with little more than an examination of some of his leading principles, which to us appear palpably fallacious.

The objection of Friends to the rites of Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, appear mainly to rest upon this argument: “That under the Christian dispensation, the worship of God is not to be formal, ceremonial, or typical, but simply spiritual.” (P. 61.)

We grant that the Christian worship should be spiritual. But whether it therefore follows that it should have no rites or ceremonies, and that if it has any, it is spiritual no longer, remains a question. This point, it appears to us, Mr. Gurney, as a general principle, has *assumed*. We look for a proof of it in vain.

The passage of scripture on which Mr. Gurney principally grounds his argument, is John iv. 21, 23, 24. “Woman, believe me, the hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem worship the Father. The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father *in spirit and in truth*; for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a spirit: and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth:”



forgetting the twenty-second verse, "Ye worship ye know not what : we know what we worship : for salvation is of the Jews : " which seems to imply that even in the Jewish worship, burdened as it was with a load of ceremonial observances, (which however would have been no burden but for the sinful state of the worshippers, but rather a delight,) there was spirituality. Now we readily grant, that it appears from the words of our Lord, as quoted by Mr. Gurney, and indeed as they stand in the Bible, that the Jewish and Samaritan worship were to be abolished, and that the new worship, which was to distinguish Christianity, was to be in spirit and in truth. But does it therefore follow, or is it any way implied, that the Christian worship was to have no rites, no ordinances, no outward forms and ceremonies? Is it impossible for a religion to be spiritual, provided it has any rites? We, on the contrary, allege, that the Christian religion, with its two sacraments, *is* spiritual. We regard the ordinances themselves, and all its ordinances, as spiritual. And we are almost inclined to ask, What would some men have?—The degree of spiritual benefit connected with the sacraments, and conveyed to us through them, may indeed, depend upon various circumstances; and the extremes, into which some have run, occasion a necessity for caution and limitation, in discussing the subject. But the general Church with one voice proclaims, that these forms are not mere forms; and that even at the lowest estimate their character is spiritual : and if that be the case, there is no need to set them aside, as opposed in their nature to a spiritual form of worship. Indeed, that their exclusion does not necessarily follow, from our Saviour's declaration that the true worshippers should worship the Father in spirit and in truth, is clear from a circumstance alleged by Mr. Gurney. He gives us a reference, (page 63, note,) to various commentators, whose explanation of our Lord's expressions, relative to the spirituality of Christian worship, agrees, he conceives, with his own. Yet did these commentators reject the sacraments? Far from it. What will the reader think, when he is told that the two last names referred to by Mr. Gurney, are those of Scott and Doddridge? Who would ever have expected to find their authority alleged, in support of such an argument? On the contrary, the comfort which one of them experienced on his death bed, in partaking of the supper of the Lord, is still fresh in our memories. Hence it appears, that it is possible to derive, from the words of our Lord, quite as high a notion of the spirituality of the Christian religion, as any that Mr. Gurney may have conceived,

yet not, on that account, to see the less benefit in the sacraments, or the less obligation to observe them.

There can be no doubt that our Saviour's birth, or rather his death, was the era of a great change in respect to the ordinances of religion. But there are notions abroad, respecting the abolition of every thing connected with the Mosaic dispensation, which are far too sweeping and indefinite: and in notions of this kind, originate some of the most pernicious crudities of modern theology. We conceive the true statement to be, that, even in respect to those things which were really abolished, there was not merely an abolition, but a substitution: not merely a disannulling of the commandment going before, for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof; but the bringing in of a better hope, by the which we draw nigh unto God. It is confidently assumed, that because the modes of admission into the Jewish Church were abolished, therefore there ought to be no mode of admission into the Christian Church. Can any inference be more fallacious? There was circumcision, by which the child, born of Jewish parents, was admitted into the Jewish Church: there was also immersion, which was used in the case of proselytes, and on some other occasions: and the Jewish ritual being dispensed with, it follows of course that the ceremonies were dispensed with, *as part of that ritual*. But it by no means follows, that nothing similar was to be adopted, as a *Christian* rite. The Jews met for public worship. It does not follow, from this, that Christians are not to meet for public worship. The Jews, many of them, searched the scriptures. It does not follow, from this, that Christians are not to search the scriptures. The Jews used occasionally to kneel in worshipping God. It does not follow from this that Christians are not to kneel. We should immediately see the futility of the argument, if a writer were to enter into a long detail, and refer us to a great many quotations in *Light-foot*, to prove that the public worship of God was practised by the Jews, and thence to infer that Christian worship is Jewish. Yet this appears to be the course which Mr. Gurney has adopted. He proves, at great length, that the Jewish dispensation had its washings or baptisms: and this to convince us that *Christian* baptism is Jewish. The Jewish baptisms were Jewish, we allow. But it does not follow from this, that the Christian dispensation may not have a baptism of its own. The argument amounts to this. The Jewish dispensation had its washings or baptisms. The Christian dispensation has its baptism also. Therefore, the Christian baptism is neither more nor less than the Jewish,

which was abolished by Christ himself. But be it remembered, there is this grand and palpable distinction : the one was a Jewish, the other a Christian rite. The one was abolished, with the dispensation to which it belonged ; the other belongs to a subsequent dispensation, which displaced the other ; and therefore it continues.

What argument indeed can we derive, against the institutions of a newly-formed Church, from the abolition of institutions belonging to a superseded Church ? At the very time when the Mosaic dispensation was disannulled, the Christian dispensation was introduced. You may say that baptism existed previously. But you cannot say that Christian baptism existed previously. We might apply, with increased power, a similar argument, to the sacrament of the Lord's supper. Within not many hours of that very time, when Christ annulled, by his death, the Jewish dispensation with all its rites, did he take bread and wine, and give them to his apostles, and say, this do in remembrance of me. How irrelevant, then, to urge that the rites superseded and the rites introduced, were precisely of the same nature. Some points of resemblance they might have. But the circumstance to be observed is, that they were not of the same nature in regard to the matter in question, the time they were to continue. And as to alleging the identity of the Jewish washings and the Christian baptism, it would be equally relevant to carry the argument one step farther ; and to say that both were precisely of the same description as the ablutions of Hindoos in the Ganges, and " plainly appertained to the same principle."

Having offered these remarks with reference to some of the general principles on which Mr. Gurney rejects the sacraments, it might be thought desirable that we should enter into an examination of the arguments, employed by him to set aside the passages of Scripture, in which, as the general Church holds and maintains, the sacraments are recognized or enjoined. But our space forbids detail ; and detail is in a measure needless. It is on general principles that the question mainly turns : and the fallacy of that principle, which would divest Christianity of its rites, because Christianity is a spiritual religion, we have already endeavoured to show. Christianity may be spiritual—and not the less spiritual, for any rites that Christ has made a part of it.

"It will be necessary for us (says Mr. Gurney) to enter into a somewhat detailed examination of the passages in question, and of several others in which baptism and the dominical supper are either alluded to, or directly mentioned. Previously, however, to entering on such an examination, I may venture upon one general observation ; *namely*,

*that if, on philological principles, any such passages are found fairly to admit of either a literal or a spiritual interpretation,—and if it be allowed (as I think it must be, for the general reasons already stated) that the latter is far more in harmony than the former, with the admitted character of the christian dispensation,—in such case we are justified by the soundest laws of biblical criticism, in adopting the spiritual and in dropping the literal interpretation.”* (P. 79.)

Indeed! Such then is Mr. Gurney's plan of scriptural exposition: and such is the consequence of looking for spiritual instruction, independent of the written word. He assumes a certain “admitted character of the Christian dispensation,” (we must say *assumes*, for that he has given us any satisfactory reasons for admitting it, we again most strenuously deny,) and then, in referring to passages of scripture which bear upon the subject under discussion, proposes to set aside, to “drop,” this literal interpretation, in order to adopt that which he conceives more conformable to his own theory. A strange design; and strangely has Mr. Gurney executed it. It is needless, however, to follow him, because we contest, in limine, that general principle on which he proceeds. He supposes that because the Christian religion is spiritual, it is to be stripped of its ordinances: but we deny any such inference.

Our readers perhaps will feel anxious, however, to learn how our author deals with some of the passages in question. At the beginning of the fourth chapter of St. John we read, that “the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, (though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples.)” Here Mr. Gurney strenuously insists upon the expression, that Jesus himself *baptized not*; and understands the whole meaning of the passage to be, that Jesus “*permitted* his disciples to practise the ceremony.” (P. 103.) But, though the first representation of the apostle, that “Jesus baptized,” is subsequently qualified by the explanatory circumstance, that it was his disciples who baptized, will any reasonable man allege the meaning of this to be, that Jesus merely *permitted* his disciples to baptize? Is it not clear that the act of the disciples was regarded as the act of Jesus himself, and imputed to him as such? Though it was the disciples who actually baptized the converts, or performed the ceremony, is it not plainly intimated that “Jesus baptized?” And could this be so, if Jesus had merely given permission? Is it not rather evident that they acted by his *command*, and for him; so that in reality the deed was as good as his, and he was the doer of it? Indeed, since Christ is here intimated to have baptized, though it was by his disciples only that the ceremony was performed, the correct inference

rence is, that baptism by the hands of Christ's disciples was Christian baptism; and, therefore, that baptism by the hands of Christian ministers is still Christian baptism, and by all means to be retained in the church, as most agreeable with our Lord's institution.

On the above passage from St. John's gospel Mr. Gurney observes, that those preachers

"who consider it their duty, in conformity with the great fundamental law of Christian worship, to abstain from the practice of baptizing their converts in water, have the consolation to know, that in adopting such a line of conduct, they are following the example of him, who is on all hands allowed to have afforded us a perfect pattern." (P. 103.) "Following the example."—We think, not exactly. In order to follow the example of Christ, we must do as Christ did on the occasion referred to. That is, our word must be with power: we must, by a divine energy residing and originating in ourselves, effectually invite, draw, and convert unbelievers: and being wholly occupied in this work of grace, we must have the aid of subordinate ministers, to receive those persons into the Church, by the rite of baptism, whom we, of our own power, have thus effectually invited, drawn, and converted. For such a "consolation," we believe, the preachers of the gospel may long wait in vain. Their true consolation will be, to resemble the *disciples* in the case now before us: to be under Christ; to act with and for him, as his agents and instruments; and that with so much fidelity, that their works shall be his, being wrought by his teaching, under his eye, in his strength, and in the order of his holy institution: to leave to him the work of operating, by his Spirit, in the hearts of his people; and to be contented with what properly belongs to themselves, the diligent application of those outward and appointed means of edification, which he has left in their hands to be administered for his glory, and the benefit of his Church.

As we pass on to the subject of the Lord's Supper, we are equally surprised at Mr. Gurney's mode of dealing with scripture. The first passage that he takes in hand, is 1 Cor. x. 15—22, which commences thus: "I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say. The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the *communion* of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the *communion* of the body of Christ?" Here Mr. Gurney exchanges the word *communion*, *κοινωνία*, for *joint participation*; rendering *κοινωνοι* and *κοινωνης*, in the subsequent verses, *joint participants*: and informing us afterwards, that he has exchanged the word *communion* for *joint participation*,

"merely for the purpose of showing the manner in which the true

meaning of: the original expression, as it is here applied, is fixed by the use, in two other parts of the same passage, of the corresponding noun, rendered *joint participants*." (P. 105.)

Mr. Gurney's *object*, perhaps, might be merely this: but the *effect* of the exchange, we conceive, is to give a new sense to the passage. The phrase "*joint participation*," implies that those who ate of the sacrament, were partakers of it *with one another*. But the original phrases, *κοινωνια τε αιματος τε Χριστου, κοινωνια τε σωματος τε Χριστου*, which our translators have very suitably rendered, "*the communion of the blood of Christ*," "*the communion of the body of Christ*," imply not merely a partaking with one another, but a spiritual participation in the body and blood of Christ himself. Therefore whatever was our author's *object*, the *effect* of the alteration, we say, has been to change the character of the passage; and to impair that sense of it which he disapproves, but which the general Church upholds.\*

The words employed by our Saviour, at the institution of the Lord's Supper, "This do in remembrance of me," "This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me," are generally regarded by Christians as a plain injunction to observe the rite. But Mr. Gurney observes, that the command "was of a nature simply *positive*." Page 113. When we came to this expression, we were inclined to ask, with some surprise, And what more could we expect? A simply positive command, on the part of our Lord, can be properly met, it might be thought, on our part, only by simple obedience. But, on examination, it appears that, by calling the command simply positive, Mr. Gurney means to intimate, that the command has nothing of the character of a *moral* precept; and merely enjoins a practice in itself indifferent.—We hold up both hands against any such doctrine. The precept "this do in remembrance of me," is, in our view of the subject, a moral precept, in every sense of the word. If our Lord had merely said, "this do," there might be some pretence for saying that the command was simply positive: but even then we know not what course, except that of simple obedience, would have remained for us. But when we hear him

---

\* Mr. Gurney has not here ventured an appeal even to Schleusner. "*Κοινωνια του αιματος και του σωματος του Χριστου* fruitio sanguinis et corporis J. C. Possis tamen commodè etiam reddere: efficit et reddit nos participes corporis et sanguinis J. C." That is: "The communion of the blood and body of Christ: the fruition of the blood and body of Jesus Christ. You may however very properly render it also; It makes and renders us partakers of the body and blood of Jesus Christ." Mr. Scott's words are, "Certainly every one would put this construction on it: and if a man really intended in his heart, what he thus professed, he would actually be partaker of the Saviour's blood shed, and body broken, for the sins of the world."

saying, "This do *in remembrance of me*," then, we maintain, the precept becomes strictly a moral precept, and the practice is in itself indifferent no longer.—We would explain ourselves. If Christ ordered us merely to eat bread and to drink wine, it might with some plausibility be urged, that the practice enjoined was in itself indifferent. But when he orders us to eat bread and to drink wine *in remembrance of him*, then the practice becomes moral in its very nature; because it is a moral duty to remember him, and the basest ingratitude to forget him; and therefore to neglect any means of remembering him, especially means which he has himself ordained, can be regarded in no other light than as morally wrong.—

"I would suggest," (says Mr. Gurney,) "that an universal obligation on the followers of any moral lawgiver to obey a precept of the nature now described, cannot be rightly admitted, unless it be by such lawgiver expressly declared: and that its not being expressly declared, affords an indication that no such universality was intended." (P. 113.)

A strange suggestion truly! As well might it be suggested, that a law enacted by parliament is not binding, unless another law be enacted to make it so. If this be the "higher and purer standard of action," which "Friends have been led to adopt," we heartily pray that the common standard of the general Church of Christ may never be brought down to it.

Not much further on, Mr. Gurney suggests that the Lord's supper, spoken of by St. Paul, in 1 Cor. xi. 20, "was probably the same as was otherwise denominated 'love,' or the 'supper of love,'" (P. 120.); attempting thus to merge the one in the other. There might be some confusion as to the names: But the only ground for alleging that the *things* were the *same*, is, that sometimes they were celebrated, in the primitive church, *together*: and the real dispute is, whether the agapæ, or love-feasts, were celebrated before or after the communion: (on which subject a certain divine rather quaintly observes, that "St. Chrysostom is of the latter opinion; the learned Dr. Cave of the former.") Now the reason why we notice this attempt of our Author's, to make it appear that the two things were one and the same, is, that we are desirous to call our readers' attention to a passage which he alleges in proof. The passage is from his favourite Schleusner, on the word *αγάπη*. "*Αγάται, agapæ, (love-feasts,) fuerunt convivia publica in conventibus Christianorum sacris instituta, conjuncta in primitiva et apostolica Ecclesia cum celebratione festiva cœnæ Dominicæ.*" "The agapæ, or love-feasts, were public banquets instituted in the sacred

assemblies of the Christians, joined together, in the primitive and apostolic church, with the festive celebration of the Lord's supper." That is, the two things were observed together, on the same occasion; and hence Mr. Gurney would have us infer that they were one and the same: but the fact is, no expressions could more clearly intimate that they were different. Had he, when he referred to Schleusner, carried his eye a little further, he would have found a circumstance mentioned, which clearly evinces this. 'Concilium Laodicenum hunc morem, qui tamen ad quartum usque seculum duravit, ob luxum et lasciviam, in quæ successu temporis abierat, abolendum judicavit.' The council of Laodicea, some say the council of Carthage, abolished the public observance of the love-feasts. The public observance of the Lord's supper continued. No two things can stand more distinct, than the ecclesiastical history of the love-feast and that of the supper of our Lord. The public celebration of the love-feast was laid aside in the fourth century, and of late years has been partially revived. The supper of the Lord has always held its ground, a public ordinance of the Church of Christ, according to our Saviour Christ's holy institution, for a continual remembrance of his death, to our great and endless comfort.

That the sacrament of the Lord's supper, indeed, was to be a standing ordinance of the Church, till the second coming of Christ, we always thought evident from the apostle's words: "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come," 1 Cor. xi. 26. But Mr. Gurney assures us, that

"The stress of his declaration plainly lies upon the words, *"Ye do shew the Lord's death."* The words *"till he come"* were probably added as a kind of reservation; for the purpose of conveying the idea that when the Lord himself should come, such a memorial of his death would be obsolete and unnecessary."!!! (P. 123.)

Enough. In having recourse to such a mode of exposition, we can regard our Author in no other light, than as throwing up the sacramental question in despair—and therefore we hasten to pass on to the next chapter.

Chapter V. treats of "the nature and character of the Christian ministry." On this subject, the view of Friends, as stated by Mr. Gurney, appears to be, that there can be no proper preaching or prophesying in the congregation, except such as proceeds from the direct and extraordinary influences of the Holy Spirit. These influences are not bestowed indiscriminately upon all, but they are the portion of particular individuals only; nor ought any to minister without them.



At the same time, Mr. Gurney admits a lower degree of spiritual aid.

"Here I would observe that there appears to exist a material distinction between *teaching* and *preaching*. While in the performance of either of these Christian duties, the dependence of the true Christian will be placed on the grace and Spirit of God, it may be freely admitted that in *teaching*, a much greater liberty is given for the use of our merely human faculties, than in the higher and more important office of prophesying, or preaching. The Spirit operates through a variety of administrations: and opportunities frequently occur, when the composition of treatises on religious subjects, when commenting on the scriptures, or when the use of other means of Christian instruction is not only allowable, but desirable." (Pp. 137, 138.)

Why then, it might be asked, may not such lower communications be turned to account, in the congregational worship of God? Mr. Gurney continues:

"But such an allowance by no means affects the principles of Friends, that with occasions so solemn as those of the congregational worship of the Deity, no ministry can be in true harmony, but such as proceeds from the direct influences of the Holy Spirit." (P. 138.)

Surely such fastidiousness is most unscriptural. And surely a ministry is allowable, and may be profitable, which cannot boast such eminent endowments as this. It does not appear that the preacher always waited for any extraordinary communication, "explicit direction," or "secret command," even in the apostolic age. If an invitation was given, if an opportunity offered, if hearers were assembled together, this appears at all times to have been held a sufficient call and direction, without waiting for any inward impulse, even by the Apostles themselves. Thus in the case of Peter, Cornelius said to him, "Now therefore are we all here present before God, to hear all things that are commanded thee of God," Acts x. 33. And it is immediately added, "Then Peter opened his mouth." He waited not, then, for any inward mandate. His hearers were present before him. That was all the call he required. Nor was his preaching, with only such a call, ineffectual. "While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word."—Again: when the Jews came to Paul at Rome, and desired to hear of him respecting the new religion, *they* appointed *him* a day, and came to him into his lodging, Acts xxviii. 23. The apostle asked no other sign. *Εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀπὸστολος*. They came, they were ready to hear; that was sufficient: and he "expounded and testified the kingdom of God." Now surely there could be no debate in the Apostle's mind, when he knew that the Jews were coming, as to whether he should be inwardly directed, or commanded, or

enabled to speak. He never contemplated the possibility of a *silent meeting*. The Jews, too, would have thought it very strange, when they arrived at the Apostle's lodgings to hear him, if not a word had been spoken to them.—So also, whenever Paul and his companions in travel arrived at any new place: The first sabbath-day, their plan was to go into the synagogue, and preach Jesus, without waiting for any special inward impulse. The moment the rulers of the synagogue sent unto them, saying, Ye men and brethren, if ye have any word of exhortation for the people, say on,—the invitation, the opportunity was the call: "Then Paul stood up," Acts xiii. 15, 16. The injunction, then, which raised him from his seat, was not the secret injunction of the Holy Spirit; but the outward injunction of the rulers of the synagogue.—At Thessalonica, again, "Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and *three sabbath-days* reasoned with them out of the scriptures," Acts xvii. 2. Doubtless then, this was the Apostle's usual course.—Nor less with Christians than with Jews. "From Miletus he went to Ephesus, and called the elders of the church. And *when they were come to him*, he said unto them," &c. Acts xx. 17, 18. He wanted no intimation then, that he was to begin, except their being come. Will our Friends attempt to persuade us that the primitive Christians ever met together for public worship, and separated, not a word having been uttered by them or by their ministers, on the plea that they had received no inward command to speak from the Holy Spirit?—It is plain, then, to us, that there must be some other rule of ministration in Christian assemblies, than that of waiting for an explicit direction or express command. It is the duty of ministers to preach in the congregation, and upon that duty they must act. They have the holy scriptures for their guide, and by that rule they must speak. In so doing, they have a just ground of hope, that they will receive whatever help and guidance from the Holy Spirit they really require. And upon that help and guidance they are to reckon, in the path of duty, and in the order of Christ's appointment. If they do not, if they prefer to keep silence, till they experience what they conceive to be a direct impulse, they may persuade themselves that this is faith, and a reliance on the extraordinary operations of the Spirit: but in our view it is rather distrust of his more usual influences, and of Christ's promise of his presence; and may amount even to a dereliction of obvious duty. "To the law and to the testimony." They need no other text book. They need indeed the Spirit's teaching; but he will teach them, they may hope, while inquiring there.

And in the faithful discharge of their functions, they may occasionally receive an aid that is indeed extraordinary. But we must look for the surest tokens of that aid, not in the feelings of the preacher merely, not in the judgment of his hearers, but in their joint growth in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Respecting the part taken by the minister in public prayer, Mr. Gurney observes,

"If he utter the written prayer, and the congregation follow him in the same words, it is sufficiently obvious that the expression of the lip and the feeling of the heart, will often be in total dissonance. The obdurate sinner may be found addressing an omnipresent Deity, in the language of contrition—the sorrowful and desponding spirit in the voice of praise and thanksgiving—the happy and rejoicing believer, in the words of mourning and woe! Nor can it be considered that a less inconsistency prevails, when the prayer of the minister is extemporaneous, but proceeds not from the spirit of the Lord, but from his own powers of invention and composition. The words which under such circumstances he may express, however satisfactory to his own mind, may often be in absolute discordance with the feelings and real condition of his hearers." (Pp. 140, 141.)

But even if a prayer be uttered by extraordinary inspiration, it is by no means certain that it will be adapted to the state and feelings of every member of the congregation. This is a point which we cannot gain, even by employing the exact words of the inspired writings. If we use a portion of the Psalms in our public worship, admirably adapted as the Psalms are to the purposes of devotion, there may be many passages in the portion used, that do not bear an application to the case of some individuals present; and few perhaps that apply to all without exception. And if extemporaneous hymns, dictated by the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit, formed part, as it is thought they did, of the public worship of the primitive Church, these also might not directly apply, throughout, to every one. All such objections, however, to forms of public worship, whether prepared or unpremeditated, arise from a disregard of that principle of unity, which ought to prevail in every Christian congregation; and upon which, we may observe, the services of the Church of England are framed. If that principle be felt, it will be felt that the whole congregation, as one in Christ, have a common interest; which is constituted by the united interests of every individual present, and which every individual present, therefore, ought to feel. Accordingly, he will rejoice with them that rejoice, and weep with them that weep. It will be no objection to him that the service contains some expressions, which do not touch his personal interests. If he is joyful, others

are afflicted: and therefore he will take part in those expressions, occurring in the service, of sorrow, of complaint, of spiritual conflict, which apply to them, though they do not apply to him. If he, on the contrary, is sorrowful, others are glad: and therefore, still upon the same principle, he will take part in those expressions of gladness, of thankfulness, of spiritual exultation, which express *their* condition, though they do not express his. It is only on such a principle, (and according to such a principle, the liturgy of the Church of England is composed,) that it is possible to unite effectually in any act of public worship. It is only upon such a principle that, in reading the devotional parts of Scripture itself, we can really enter into their spirit. It will not, indeed, be the spirit of those, whose whole idea of public worship is, that we are to come together to hear the gospel preached, or a prayer delivered, and then to separate, without the least care or concern for one another. But it will be essentially the spirit of those, who are one in Christ.

There are some things in the chapter now under consideration, as well as in the preceding, which appear to us either not very correct, or not very relevant. Our Author alleges, that among the ancient Israelites, the prophets

*"were distinguished from their countrymen, not by hereditary dignity or official appointment, but simply by the gifts of the Spirit."* (P. 143.)

This allegation, however, must be taken *cum grano salis*. That the prophets were distinguished from their countrymen by the gifts of the Spirit, will not be denied. But whether they were distinguished by them alone, whether "hereditary dignity or official appointment" had never any thing to do with the distinction, we are much inclined to question. First, as to hereditary dignity, there appears strong reason for believing that the prophetic office occasionally passed, such being the will of God, from father to son. The prophetic as well as the kingly office, was evidently hereditary in the Son of David. The expression, "the sons of the prophets," which occurs more than once or twice in the Old Testament, may perhaps be considered ambiguous. The "man of the sons of the prophets," 1 Kings xx. 35, was evidently a prophet himself, vv. 38, 41. Some think, however, that the persons referred to were scholars, not sons. But, be that as it may, let us, on this subject of hereditary dignity, hear the words of a Jewish writer. "Our Rabbins of happy memory say, that every prophet whose name and his father's name is set down in his prophecy, it is certain that he was a prophet, and the son of a prophet . . . . And they say that he whose father and

father's father's name is set down in his prophecy, was a greater man of parentage, than he whose father is only named. As in Zephaniah, ch. i. vers. i." (Kimchi, as quoted by Lightfoot, *Miscellanies*, chap. xi.) Thus it certainly appears that the prophets were sometimes distinguished from their countrymen by hereditary dignity, as well as by the gifts of the Spirit. Amos indeed, at the very moment when he disowns any thing of the kind, in his own ease, seems to intimate that it sometimes occurred, in the cases of others; saying, "I was no prophet, neither was I a prophet's son," ch. vii. 14. (And accordingly, his father's name is not given at the beginning of his prophecy, consistently with Kimchi's rule.) Secondly, with regard to the prophets not being distinguished from their countrymen by *official appointment*, we have an instance directly opposed to this representation, in the command given to Elijah, 1 Kings, xix. 15, 16. "Anoint Hazael to be King over Syria: and Jehu the son of Nimshi shalt thou anoint to be king over Israel: and Elisha the son of Shaphat of Abel-meholah shalt thou anoint to be prophet in thy room." If this be not an instance of official appointment, what can be so called? And the example affords us ground for supposing, that something similar took place in other cases. Accordingly, it is intimated by St. John, that the high priest, Caiaphas, was a prophet by virtue of his office. "Being high priest that year, he prophesied," John xi. 51.

Again, we do not think there is much relevancy in the first proof offered by Mr. Gurney, that the verbal ministrations of the Apostles of Jesus Christ were immediately inspired of the Holy Ghost. That this was the case indeed, "all Christians," as he says, "allow;" (though not to the extent perhaps that he would wish: for instance, Lightfoot says, "Even the Apostles themselves at the first setting forth into the ministry, did not preach by the Spirit, but" (except) "what they had learned and gotten by hearing, study, conference, and meditation." *Harmony of the New Testament*, Sec. xxvii.) But how does Mr. Gurney proceed to prove his position?

"When our Lord sent forth his disciples to heal the sick and to preach the gospel, he said to them, 'Ye shall be brought before governors and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them and the Gentiles. But when they deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that same hour, what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you;' Matt. x. 18—20." (P. 144.)

That is, when they were brought, as culprits, before governors and kings, they were to take no thought. The emergency was extraordinary: and therefore an extraordinary

help would be given. But it by no means follows from this, that they would always receive a help of the same kind, in their "verbal ministrations:" or that when they knew, before-hand, that an occasion would soon offer, when they would have to address a Christian, Jewish, or heathen assembly, they were *then* to take no thought, before-hand, how or what they should speak. In fact, nothing can be less to the purpose, than to allege the rule given to the Apostles for their conduct on the extraordinary occasion, as the rule which was to regulate their verbal ministrations. Let Mr. Gurney show us any direction, either to the Apostles or to their successors, to take no thought when they had to minister in the congregation, and he will indeed put the question in a new light. The most particular direction that now occurs to us, is of a very different character. "Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine. Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. Meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them; that thy profiting may appear to all. Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee." 1 Tim. iv. 13—16.

Mr. Gurney, however, subsequently quotes 1 Cor. xiv. 23—33, a passage relating to the proceedings in the religious assemblies of the early Christians; and on this passage offers various remarks. The first remark is, "That the ministry which the apostle describes as exercised on these occasions, was not prepared or premeditated, but arose out of the direct impulses of the Spirit of God." (P. 147.)

Suppose it to have arisen out of such direct impulses. It does not follow from this, that there was no preparation or premeditation. "When ye come together," says the Apostle in the passage quoted, "every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation." Verse 26. Does this imply that there was no preparation? We should rather say it implies, that when they came together, each of them came prepared with his psalm, with his doctrine, &c.; and that each wished to be the first, in giving vent to his own contribution towards the services of the day; whence arose the confusion which the Apostle appears to censure, in the first and last verses of the passage quoted. That every part of the services also, was *not* a direct revelation, appears from v. 30: "If any thing be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace." The plain inference seems to be, that it was *not* in

the usual course of the services for any thing to be revealed : that the usual course was, to proceed with the ordinary ministrations ; but if any thing was revealed to another sitting by, this was so extraordinary a manifestation from above, that it was not to be lost, and the person who happened to be ministering at the time was to hold his peace, and he, to whom the revelation had been made, was to utter it, for the good of the Church. " If any thing be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace." If nothing be revealed, then, let the first proceed, with his ordinary ministrations.

The next chapter relates to the " selection, preparation, and appointment, of the ministers of the gospel." Here again we must decline entering into details ; and indeed this may be thought the less needful, because really, stripped of the envelopement of words, the views of our Friends, upon these subjects, do not appear so very different from those of some other classes of Christians. Mr. Gurney urges that there can be no appointment to the ministry, except by the Holy Spirit ; meaning that man ought to have no concern in it. Now it does not by any means appear to us, that the concern taken by human agents, necessarily interferes with that which properly belongs to the divine Agent. We are rather inclined to believe, that the two often go together. There is a passage of Scripture referring to this subject, which, we think, has not received all the consideration which it deserves. " The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." 2 Tim. ii. 2. Here it is worth our attention, and the circumstance has not perhaps been noticed as it deserves, that we have an intimation of an apostolic succession, extending to those who came fourth in order. First of all we have St. Paul himself, who received his commission and his instructions immediately from our Lord. Second in order comes Timothy, who had " heard " of St. Paul. Next come the " faithful men," to whom Timothy was to commit what he had heard : and lastly come the " others also," whom those faithful men were to teach. Thus we have a succession which carries us far beyond the Apostles themselves. And the thing to be observed is, that what was thus to be transmitted in regular succession, was not the mere management of the affairs of the Church, but Christian doctrine, and the apostolic commission to communicate Christian doctrine. The inference then is, not that St. Paul, in giving this commission, meant to *exclude* the operation of the Holy Ghost ; far from it : but that this ope-

ration wrought *by* the human agency; and might be just as complete and absolute and free, as if no human agency had been concerned. Indeed the main error of Mr. Gurney, both in the present chapter and in other parts of the work, consists, as it appears to us, in his assuming that wherever human agency is concerned, there, in the same proportion, the agency of the Holy Spirit is of necessity excluded; and that therefore human agency is bad, as keeping out the Spirit's agency. We on the contrary maintain, that in operating upon man, the Holy Spirit almost uniformly operates by and through man; whether by and through the individual or individuals alone, who are the subjects of the operation, or with and through others also.

Mr. Gurney, holding it to be the undivided prerogative of the great Head of the Church himself, to choose, to prepare, and to ordain, his own ministers, it necessarily follows, according to his erroneous views, as we conceive them to be, that men ought to have no concern, in any of these steps. But we have always observed, however far these notions are carried in theory, that when it comes to practice, there is sure to be interference somewhere: and in the case of Friends, if, as we said before, we strip away the envelopement of words, this interference will be found very palpably to lie with the congregation: and that, quite in as great a degree, in some respects, as with other classes of dissenters, or even in a greater. Our Author indeed assures us, that in the *appointment* of ministers, as well as their *selection* and *preparation*, Friends esteem the interference of man to be needless, improper, and, on the principles which they entertain, impossible. Be it so. We will not now contend about terms. But we maintain, and we hope to make it apparent from Mr. Gurney's own words, that in the *acknowledgment*, *licensing*, *deposition*, and constant, authoritative, *superintendence* of ministers, our Friends do exert an interference, of a very palpable kind.

1. ACKNOWLEDGMENT. "Lastly, after they have been *acknowledged* as ministers," &c. (p. 178.)

This indeed is according to the avowed principles of the society.

"Nevertheless, the decision of the question, whether the minister be really acting under divine authority, or otherwise, rests not so much with himself, as with the church." (Pp. 188, 189.)

2. LICENSING. (We the rather use this term, because it is when the minister travels, for ministerial purposes, from one place to another, that the practice to which we allude occurs: and it is, in our own Church, when the curate removes to a



new scene of duty, that he obtains the written licence of the bishop.)

"They," the brethren and sisters, "..... set him at liberty for his journey; ..... and, for the satisfaction of those persons, among whom his lot may be cast, bestow upon him a certificate of their concurrence and approbation. Thus provided with the recorded sanction of his friends, and 'sent forth,' as he humbly trusts, 'by the Holy Ghost,' to the work appointed him, the minister proceeds on his journey."\* (Pp. 186, 187.)

**3. DEPOSITION.**—"If, however, in any persons, who have received the gift of the ministry, a watchful dependence upon God is not maintained, and thus their services degenerate into the use of words without life, the spiritually-minded hearer will not fail to observe so important a change; and thus, while the members of a religious society are "subject to one another in love," and a right Christian oversight is preserved among them, it will not, for the most part, be found a difficult matter to prevent the continuance, in any congregation, of a *spurious* ministry." (P. 136.)

**4. CONSTANT AND AUTHORITATIVE SUPERINTENDENCE.**—This appears from the last extract; to which we may add the following.

"Christians are ever to be subject one to another in love, and it must, in great measure, devolve on their brethren, to determine whether those who speak the word, are rightly invested with their functions, or whether their communications rest on no better foundation than their own will. The generality of my readers are probably well aware that one of the principal duties of the elders in our religious Society, is to watch over the ministry, to guard against the encroachments of unsound and unauthorized doctrine; to encourage the feeble, and the diffident, and to restrain the forward and the hasty among the Lord's servants." &c. (P. 181.)

Thus we think it is quite evident, that the Friends, whatever may be their peculiarities in theory, do practically exert a very marked interference with the ministerial office, with respect both to the *acknowledgment*, the *licensing*, the *deposition*, and the constant and authoritative *superintendence* of their ministers.

The plan which they thus pursue, to us appears full-fraught with pernicious tendencies. It is the minister, we conceive, who is to uphold the faith in a congregation. But according to this plan, the congregation are to regulate the minister. He should be as the standard-bearer in the battle, who holds up his ensign for a rallying-point, in the thickest of the fight;

\* Here, it might be thought, there is an interference, according to Mr. Gurney's principles, of a very pernicious kind: namely, that of the "recorded sanction" with the "sending forth;" the human authority with the divine mission. If the licence or recorded sanction were to be withheld, would the minister be sustained on the strength of the divine mission alone?

and still holds it up, when the whole host around him begin to flinch. But, according to the tactics of our Friends, whenever they lose ground, the standard-bearer must be carried away with them. To say the truth, even in respect to those three points, on which Mr. Gurney particularly insists, the selection, preparation, and appointment of ministers, we are inclined to think that the principles of Friends do virtually involve some degree of interference. Thus when we are told, in a passage already quoted, that it is one of the duties of the elders "to encourage the feeble and the diffident" among the Lord's servants, we cannot help thinking that we discover in this, (we mean, as we have already intimated, in practice, not in terms,) something very much like selection and preparation. If the elders regard any one, who is feeble and diffident, in their congregation, as a proper object of encouragement, and only say so, even to one another, not to the person himself, this, it appears to us, amounts to something very like *selection*. But if they not merely express their sentiments to one another, but go so far as to "encourage" the individual himself, this is neither more nor less than *preparation*. But the encouragement of which Mr. Gurney speaks, is only bestowed, he will tell us, upon ministers who are already appointed. We question, however, whether this distinction can ever be strictly kept up in practice: especially since, if the appointment be entirely of divine influence, without any interposition of human concurrence, it will be impossible always to define with accuracy, at what precise moment it has taken place, particularly in the case of "the feeble and the diffident." But, lastly, as to the appointment itself. What does Mr. Gurney mean by saying, as we have seen, that "it must, in great measure, devolve on their brethren, to determine whether those who speak the word, are *rightly invested with their functions*?" Do not these words imply human appointment? He may say, he only means acknowledgment. But an acknowledgment which amounts to a right investiture in the functions of the ministerial office, certainly implies, to our ears, all that is essentially conveyed, not only by the word, *appointment*, but even by those ecclesiastical, pontifical, popish, Babylonish terms, *ordination*, *institution*, *establishment*, nay *priesthood* itself. And, in reality, the very act of sending forth a minister with a written sanction, though it is not the same thing as appointing him at first, certainly amounts to an appointment to minister in those congregations, in which, without that written sanction, his ministry would not be received, but, with it, is received as a matter of course. Indeed, however strenuously our

Friends may allege that they have no hand in the appointment of their ministers, surely if they judge, recognize, decide upon the qualifications of their ministers, it amounts to the same thing. If the congregation "decide the question, whether the minister be really acting under divine authority, or otherwise," in the affirmative, he is their minister: if in the negative, he is not their minister. To what does this amount, then, but that they take the appointment entirely into their own hands? And the point to be particularly observed is, that their system leaves them fully liable to that risk, which they impute to the systems of others; namely, the risk of sometimes rejecting or suspending a ministry, that has the true qualifications from on high. Suppose a minister, whose doctrine is sound, to begin to preach in a congregation whose doctrine is unsound. Is it not clear, according to the plan pursued among Friends, that this minister must be rejected? Indeed, while the opinions and the system of Friends continue such as Mr. Gurney represents them, we apprehend that a man preaching sound doctrine upon many points of very essential import, could not possibly fail of being rejected, in any of their congregations.

In the chapter now before us, Mr. Gurney assumes, as incontrovertible and acknowledged facts, some things, respecting which the Christian world are by no means agreed.

"The office of the Bishops or Overseers," he tells us, "and that of the Presbyters or Elders, was in the earliest Christian churches, identical." (P. 165.)

This is a point upon which Christians differ. *We* feel happy in belonging to a very numerous body, called Episcopalians, who decidedly hold the opposite opinion: and who can only allow, at the very utmost, that the functions of the two offices were sometimes performed, in primitive times, as they still are, by the same person; and that, now and then, the *names* were confounded. It is a point also, which those who differ from us by no means take for granted, but generally condescend to argue with us. Neither Mr. Gurney, then, nor Schleusner (*δ κυρωτης*;) to whom he refers, is justified in assuming the point, as conceded or proved.—Again:

"In many instances it must be confessed, that the persons who were called upon of the Lord to become preachers of righteousness, were altogether destitute of the advantage of erudition. That this was the matter of fact, in an especial degree, with most of those pre-eminently able ministers, the apostles of Jesus Christ, is universally understood and acknowledged." (P. 174.)

By no means. Most persons are of that *opinion*; nor does it materially differ from our own. Nothing of the kind, how-

ever, is "universally understood and acknowledged:" indeed there are some, who have gone to great lengths in maintaining the opposite opinion.—Again:

"Every Christian will allow that the prophets, apostles, and evangelists, . . . were prepared for their office before they were called upon to exercise its duties; and it is equally incontrovertible, that this preparation, which in some instances appears to have been gradual and long continued, and in others, short and sudden, was of the Lord, and not of man." (P. 171.)

This cannot be called incontrovertible, by any means. We agree that their preparation was "of the Lord," but we deny that it was "not of man." Ananias was concerned in the preparation of Paul, (Acts ix. 10—18.) Paul and others, in the preparation of Timothy; his mother, probably, among the rest; (1 Tim. iv. 14. 2 Tim. i. 5.) (conf. iii. 15. ii. 2. iii. 14.) The prophets and teachers, who ministered at Antioch, prepared Paul and Barnabas, even for a special work, whereunto the Holy Ghost had called them. Nor, *though* the Holy Ghost had called them, were they sent away, till their brethren in the ministry "had fasted, and prayed, and laid their hands on them," Acts xiii. 1—3. Though therefore the preparation of these several individuals was of the Lord, yet the Lord was pleased to make use of men, as the instruments in preparing them: and it is unsound to say that the preparation was of the Lord, and not of man, as if the one were opposed to the other.\* The true character of the mission of Paul and Barnabas, indeed, appears from the manner in which the sacred writer speaks of it. "When they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they *sent them away* (ἀπέλυσαν.) So they, being *sent forth by the Holy Ghost*, (ἐκπεμφθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ Ἁγίου,) departed unto Seleucia," ver. 3, 4. So that here the two things went together: the dismission, on the part of their brother ministers, and the sending forth, on the part of the Holy Ghost; and the former by no means interfered with the latter, or made it less complete than it otherwise would be; but rather was the sign and effectual instrument of it.

Chapter the seventh relates to "the pecuniary remuneration of the ministers of the gospel."

Chapter the eighth treats "on the ministry of women." In favour of this practice, as maintained in the religious meetings of Friends, our author urges some instances of female prophets or prophecy under the Jewish dispensation, and in

\* Though very proper, in tracing the apostolic authority to its source, or first cause. Gal. i. 1.

the first ages of the Church; and also a prediction of the prophet Joel, that the daughters as well as the sons should prophesy; together with a fulfilment of this prediction, narrated in the second chapter of the Acts. In opposition to the practice, it is usual to allege two passages from the apostle Paul; in which, if words have meaning, he condemns the interference of females in the public ministrations of the Christian Church, in terms of unqualified reprehension. Respecting these testimonies, thus oppositely alleged, Mr. Gurney observes,

“Now, on the comparison of these injunctions with the other passages of Scripture already cited, and especially with the prophecy of Joel, and the history of its fulfilment, the interpreter of the sacred volume appears to be driven into one of two decisions: the first, that the apostles and prophets, whose works must be ultimately traced to the same divine Author, have contradicted one another; and this on a point of considerable practical importance: the second, that the public speaking of women, so positively forbidden by Paul, was not that description of speaking which arose out of the immediate impulses of the Holy Spirit.” (P. 219.)

It does not appear to us that we are *driven* into either of these decisions: the former being inadmissible, and the latter such as we can readily assent to, without any driving. However, be that as it may, there is a very easy way of explaining the difficulty, if indeed it can be called one: namely, by supposing that the prediction of Joel relates to some extraordinary occasion; like the wonders in heaven and earth, the blood and fire and pillars of smoke, the darkened sun, and the blood-discoloured moon, predicted in the subsequent verses, (Joel ii. 30, 31;) and that the public prophesyings of females, which occurred in conformity with the prediction, were something equally extraordinary, equally out of the natural course of things, and if we may so say, equally prodigious and portentous: but that, on the contrary, the prohibitions of St. Paul relate to the regular order of the public ministry of the Church; and therefore condemn the ministry of women, as now practised in the religious assemblies of Friends, and that in terms of explicit, unqualified, and flagrant reprehension. “Let your women keep silence in the Churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the Church,” 1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35. “Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence,” 1 Tim. ii. 11, 12.

As it appears, however, that, in consequence of the peculiar notions of Friends on the subject of maintaining their ministers, the greater number of them must, of necessity, pursue some line of business for the support of their families, and therefore can have little leisure to devote themselves to the duties and studies, which are generally deemed essential to an efficient ministry, we are inclined to hope that the public exertions of their mothers, sisters, and daughters, though, as we conceive, blameable and unbecoming in themselves, may be overruled for good. May they not afford an opening to farther irregularities ; but supply the want or the deficiencies of a less totally anomalous and prohibited ministry !

Chapter the ninth relates to "silent worship."—There are, no doubt, occasions, in which silence is good. It is very seasonable when we are alone. Then appears to be the proper time for that inward silence of the soul, when it is dumb and prostrate before its Maker, which Mr. Gurney so strenuously recommends ; and which might occasionally, though only occasionally, be found profitable to us all. We say, only occasionally ; for the right attitude of the soul, we conceive, with regard to its Maker, will be, for the most part, not an attitude of quiescence and passive expectation, but of seeking, of striving upwards, of laying hold, of earnest reaching forth, out of the world of things seen into the world of things unseen, of drawing nigh and pressing forward with purpose of heart, in the power of the Spirit, through the manifested Son to the invisible Father. At any rate, silence, in the religious meetings of Christians, seems to defeat the very object, for which they are held : namely, that of *uniting* in the worship of God. Mr. Gurney first asks, who will deny that the Lord

"instructs his people, not only by means of the ministry of his servants, but by the secret and immediate operations of his Holy Spirit ?"

and then adds—

"if this point be allowed, and if it be further granted, . . . that the periods appointed for the congregational worship of God, are times when the immediate teaching of Christ may reasonably be expected ; the propriety of *silence* on such occasions is at once established." (P. 238.)

We grant so much as this ; that the Lord can and often does communicate with the minds of his people, otherwise than by the intervention of any human voice : and also that he does often, in an especial manner, communicate with them at the season and place of public worship. But it does not follow, that he there *so* communicates with them : it does not follow that the Lord is particularly pleased to com-

municate with his people, without the intervention of their brethren, while they are in the company of their brethren. We, indeed, are rather inclined to uphold the contrary opinion; and to maintain that, in a place of public worship, true edification is rather to be expected by the congregation in hearing, by the priest in uttering the word, and by both in united prayer and praise. Hence, though silence may, in some places, in a religious point of view, be good, we maintain that in a place of worship, as a general observance, it is evil, as defeating the very object of the public assemblage. For, even supposing some of those who are present to worship in silence, yet, while silence is maintained, there can be no united worship, (unless, indeed, it be called united worship to be worshipping at the same time;) and therefore the end of the meeting is not answered.

The passive, quiescent, or as it has been called, pacific theology, appears to have one very serious defect; namely, an unconsciousness of man's real state: an unconsciousness of his guilt, his misery, and his danger. A due sense of this state, tends to keep the mind in an attitude of constant seeking, of constant application and aspiration towards God. The mind will not be merely torpidly sensible of its helplessness and unworthiness; it will be actively sensible of its strong necessities, and therefore will be ever actively seeking some strong consolation and help, and as it were constantly appealing from itself, and from its own depravity and miseries, to the tribunal of a merciful God and Saviour, who has redeemed, and who is mighty to deliver. In this view of its condition, its proper breath is prayer: and in an assembled congregation, with this common view, the common breath, it might be thought, would be prayer also; audible and united prayer, for that present help which their present need requires. How then a Christian community can ever meet together, and separate without having united in prayer, to us appears, on any good principle, inexplicable. There are so many things, bearing immediately upon our condition or attention, which seem to call for the immediate exercise of prayer. It seems therefore unaccountable, that Christians should come together to a place, where they believe God to be more immediately present, and be contented, while there, to sit and wait, without taking the opportunity to seek and ask. You are now in the King's presence: it may be some time before you are so again: now then is the time to present your petition. Embrace it, as you value your best interests. Are you at a loss what to ask? There are the standing exigencies of the Church of Christ. There are the miseries of a whole

world that lieth in wickedness. There are the wants, the urgent, pinching wants, of your own perishing and immortal soul. It requires no extraordinary influence of the Spirit, to make you *sensible* of these: yet you think you must have an extraordinary influence, or you cannot *express* them. Can you, however, go away, without having made the attempt? Then, it is too much to be feared, you are *not* rightly sensible of them.

Let us suppose ourselves, in the first instance, to have adopted the views of Friends. We believe that God has bestowed a measure of his Spirit upon us all; yet we set out upon the principle, that unless he bestow upon us a more extraordinary and special measure, we will not lift up our voices in honour of his name. The consequence is, that our religious meetings terminate, without the rendering of any such acknowledgment of his bounties, and this often. Finding such to be the case, it might be expected that we should reason thus. Since we do not always receive an extraordinary power, may we not avail ourselves of the ordinary means of grace? Will it not be well, for instance, to have a portion of Scripture read? No particular inspiration, indeed, is now given to us: but "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable,"—might we not then endeavour to profit by it?—"for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." Is there no way, either, in which we might join in giving thanks, and making known our requests for those things, whereof we now stand in need, before God? We feel no extraordinary impulse, indeed: but we feel that we have present, urgent wants. Shall we go away, then, from the mercy seat, without having offered our petition, and made our wants known? Surely, we may attempt to make them known, without the aid of a miracle. A beggar asks charity, without waiting for inspiration. A drowning man calls for help, without the gift of the Spirit.—And surely, since Christ died and intercedes for us, the meanest petitions, unless he died in vain, may find acceptance through him. His presenting them will give them a value and a power, which in themselves they want. But no!

"Whenever it happens that no one present possesses a gift in the ministry, or that the individuals who possess such a gift are not called into the exercise of it, the consequence (if the principles of the Society are properly maintained) is necessarily this—that the silence with which the meeting commences, continues uninterrupted until the time arrives for its separation." (P. 228.)

The next chapter treats on Oaths. It is well known that



Friends object not only, like other Christians, to swearing in conversation, but to judicial oaths.

"If, on any particular occasion, a man swear in addition to his ye a or nay, in order to render them more obligatory or convincing, their force becomes comparatively weak at other times, when they receive no such confirmation. If such an one is a believer in the Lord Jesus, and especially if he is a serious professor of religion, it is plain that by his conduct he gives countenance to the false and dangerous notion, that the oath of the Christian is more binding upon his conscience, and *therefore more credible*, than his deliberate word, and thus he inevitably lowers the *standard* of the law of truth." (P. 244.)

There is some plausibility in this argument; but it does not appear to have much real weight. A Christian who takes an oath in a court of justice, does not expect the less, on that account, to be believed in common conversation upon his simple word.—The Almighty, as we are reminded in the Epistle to the Hebrews, confirmed his promise by an oath, chap. vi. 13—17. Not that the oath was "more binding" in itself, but because it would be more satisfactory to us: as the sacred writer goes on to say; "That by *two* immutable things," namely the oath and the promise, "in which it was impossible for God to lie, *we might have a strong consolation.*" It would be equally impossible for God to lie, had there been the promise only. The oath therefore was added, not as essential, but for our satisfaction. It is so also when the Christian swears in a court of law. It is held satisfactory, and he is willing to give the satisfaction required. The law of the land exacts it of him, and he knows of no sufficient reason to disobey. Still his simple word is equally believed out of court: and would be, by all who knew him, in court.

While, however, Friends object to judicial oaths, it will be necessary to bear in mind the view taken of the subject by Mr. Gurney, which is rather a limited one. "Self-imprecation" he considers "essential to every oath," p. 264. According to this view, then, there can be no oath, unless there be self-imprecation. For instance, the usual form in our judicial courts is an oath, because there the witness says, "So help me God," imprecating upon himself the loss of the divine help, if he gives false evidence. St. Paul, on the contrary, utters no oath in those passages which are sometimes cited in defence of the practice: as where he says, "*God is my witness*—that without ceasing I make mention of you always in my prayers," Rom. i. 9. The appeal here made by the Apostle to the Almighty, we may very reasonably interpret, rather, as only one of those instances, in

which he asserts a divine authority. P. 259. — Again : “ Neither at any time used we flattering words, as ye know, nor a cloke of covetousness ; *God is witness :* ” 1 Thess. ii. 5. “ Now the things which I write unto you, *behold, before God, I lie not :* ” Gal. i. 20. In these passages there is no oath, because there is no imprecation. Neither is there any real oath or imprecation, in the following passage, “ Moreover I call God for a record upon my soul, that to spare you, I came not as yet unto Corinth ; ” 2 Cor. i. 23 : because, though in the original, and in the English as it now stands, this looks very like an imprecation, and indeed has generally been taken for one, yet the passage may be rendered, “ I call God for a witness of my mind,” &c. ; so that, in English at least, the imprecation is got rid of. And by the same rule, namely, that “ self-imprecation ” is “ essential to every oath,” of course it follows that what the Lord sware, in a passage already referred to, was no oath, though, with the Apostle, we have generally considered it one :—for there was evidently no imprecation, “ no calling down upon himself of any dreaded penalty,” *here*.

Hence, we say, it is apparent, that though Friends object to judicial oaths, yet Mr. Gurney affords us a much less comprehensive view than we had been accustomed to take, of the extent of their objection. They decline to take the oath used in our courts of law, because here the self-imprecation occurs. But there is not the same objection to the oath formerly used, as Mr. Gurney informs us, in the Jewish courts ; “ Behold I swear by the name of the Lord God of Israel, that such or such is the truth : ” there is not the same objection to the solemn attestations of St. Paul ; “ God is my witness ; ” “ Behold, before God, I lie not ; ” “ I call God for a record (or a *witness*) upon my soul (or of *my mind*.) ” Surely then, something might be framed upon the model of these scriptural expressions to which our Friends would feel a less insurmountable objection. We allege them as oaths, but Mr. Gurney tells us they are no oaths. Friends, then, it might be hoped, would conform to them. No, Mr. Gurney will say, even supposing that the Apostle Paul has sworn in his Epistles,

“ yet I apprehend that no reasonable Christian, in the regulation of his own conduct, would pretend to justify himself by the *example* of Paul, in the infringement of the *law* of Christ.” (P. 260.)

And *did* the Apostle, then, employ such adjurations, as the law of Christ forbids ? Is this supposition to be tolerated for one moment ? Yet this is what we are brought to, by a plain inference, from Mr. Gurney’s premises. Either you

may take such oaths as St. Paul took, with a safe conscience, or else you must hold, that the Apostle's example stands opposed to his Master's law. Rather let us say, the Apostle's example proves that you misinterpret his Master's law; and that you would lay a yoke upon us, where the law does not bind us, and where the example of the Apostle gives us liberty. So also, when it is urged, that, were it matter of fact that Jesus, when before the high-priest, and adjured by him, was, after the manner then in use in the Jewish courts, actually put upon his oath, and did actually take it, even this "would afford no sufficient reason why Christians should swear, in contravention of the direct command of their Divine Master." (P. 256.) Rather let us say, this would go to negative your allegation of any such direct command really existing. Indeed, nothing that Mr. Gurney has advanced moves us from our opinion, that the object of our divine Master's command, in the passage referred to, was to forbid conversational blasphemies, and irreverence. (Matt. v. 33—37.)

We think it rather strange that Mr. Gurney, in speaking of our Saviour in this chapter, and attempting to make it appear that, when before his judges, he took no oath, should say that "He was not attending the court as a witness, *neither was there any fact to which he was called upon to depose;*" (P. 256.) yet presently after should add, that

"the High Priest *solemnly enjoined* him to declare to the Sanhedrim, whether he was or was not the Son of God." (P. 257.)

This was the fact, to which Jesus was called upon to depose. And, in this respect, though brought as a culprit before his judges, he *was* attending the court as a witness. To this fact, it appears to us, he deposed, as a witness upon oath, ("bearing witness of himself," as he said on another occasion, and that, quite according to the usual form of bearing witness in the Jewish courts;) when "the high priest said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God," and "Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said." Matt. xxvi. 63, 64. It is by no means correct to say that Jesus was not attending the court as a witness, for he kept up that character throughout; and therefore the apostle Paul gives Timothy a charge, "Before Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate *witnessed* a good confession," (1 Tim. vi. 13 :) and therefore Christ himself also, when questioned by Pontius Pilate upon the very subject on which the high priest adjured him, namely his personal dignity, spake of "bearing *witness* to the truth," John xviii. 37. If the fact of our Lord's having really taken an

oath, turns upon whether or no he was in court as a witness, it must, we think, be decided in the affirmative.

The next chapter is on war. In the number of the *British Review* for February, 1819, there is an article respecting the "Society for the promotion of universal Peace;" in which the question between us and Friends, on the subject of war, is discussed, and some of the texts of scripture, which bear most directly upon the subject, are considered. Nor do we think that there is much, in Mr. Gurney's present remarks, to which some answer may not here be found. But though we differ from him upon this subject also, we shall ever rejoice in the success of any legitimate measures, for the promotion of national as well as of spiritual peace. And, though we hold that some wars are just and necessary, we are, at the same time, not disposed to deny, that there have been others both iniquitous and needless. And we are well aware that in some instances, there may have been so much to blame in all the powers concerned, that, however opposed in interest, they have been too plainly associated in guilt. When, however, we turn our eyes to a certain remote quarter of Europe, which, in a struggle against Mohamedan barbarism, now engages the warmest sympathies of many amongst us, we are led to doubt, whether, in the present day, one of the greatest sins of Christendom, as far as taking up arms is concerned, be not a sin of omission.

The twelfth chapter is entitled "On the moral views of Friends: plainness of speech, behaviour, and apparel." In conformity with this title, before entering on the separate discussion of the three specified topics, Mr. Gurney offers a few general and introductory remarks, with respect to the moral views of his community.

In considering these remarks, standing as they do before the threefold discussion already mentioned, our thoughts have been more than once carried to a certain Rabbinical contraction, of a threefold form. This contraction stands thus: *תָּרועָה תְּרועָה תְּרועָה* and, unfolded into its full signification, gives us the words *תְּרועָה תְּרועָה תְּרועָה*. The expression is descriptive of the blowing of the trumpets by the priests; and Lightfoot very ingeniously renders it, by the vernacular term, *tara-tan-tara*. To speak plainly, we do think there is a little trumpeting in this part of the work: and though many practices are set forth, very creditable to our Friends, we can but recommend attention to the precept, *μη σαλπίζης εμπροσθεν σου*. Thus, it is intimated, that

"Friends have been led to adopt a higher and purer standard of action, and one which appears to be more exactly conformed to the

requisitions of the divine law, than that which generally prevails among their fellow-christians." (P. 299.)

Again; we are told of their "*completeness* of view respecting good and evil," p. 301. (It is a very bold and exceptionable expression.) The testimony of Friends against the use of an oath, "is founded on a just though exalted view" of the law of truth and integrity. (P. 301, 302.)

"With reference to the Christian law of mercy, charity, and love, the same high standard will be found to prevail in the professed sentiments, and to a great extent, in the known history of the Society of Friends."

"A similar quickness and nicety of apprehension, and general clearness of conduct, has been the result of their religious principles, with regard to capital punishments, the slave trade, and slavery." (P. 303.)

"On the present occasion I would only remark, that no one sect of Christians of whom I have ever heard, have been led to uphold a higher standard than that maintained among Friends, respecting the importance," &c. (P. 306.)

Nay, even where our author is most anxious to guard himself from the imputation of boasting, we can but think that we hear only a different note of the trumpet.

"Before we proceed further, I must request the candid reader explicitly to understand, that, in making the observations which have now been offered, on the moral system maintained among Friends, I have been very far from any intention to *panegyryze* the members of that Society. On the contrary, when we consider the high degree of religious light which has been so mercifully bestowed upon us, and the clear views into which we have been led of the spirituality of the gospel dispensation, (π ῆ π) we may readily confess that, in the inadequacy and shortness of our good works, we have peculiar cause for sorrow and humiliation." (P. 307, 308.)

Indeed, that there is some cause we are not disposed to doubt. We certainly are not of the number of those, who, while they do not adopt the religious peculiarities of Friends, regard them with complacency. We can consent to no compromise. Much of what Mr. Gurney particularizes, is no doubt very proper and laudable: and we are willing to grant all the indulgence that is due to peculiarities, as springing from speculative errors. But we question the soundness of the system; and we acknowledge not that high standard of morality, which sees, in the injunction of our Saviour to maintain a practice in remembrance of him, no intimation of a moral duty; and which regards the establishment of claims for tithes, by the law of the civil state, as "in itself one reason, among others, which renders a refusal to comply with them binding on the conscience." (P. 207, 208.)

The first of the three topics treated of in order, is "plainness of speech." Our own view upon the subject is, that it becomes Christians not to invent terms of civility, or to address persons, in such as have not already been usually employed; but not to abstain from the employment of those, which they find in common use. In this respect, there will always be a seemly parsimony in the conversation of the true Christian, which will guard him from complimentary extremes. But occasions, we conceive, will continually arise, in which he will feel it his duty not to withhold certain received expressions of honour or respect. This, in fact, appears to have been the principle, which was adopted by Luke the Evangelist, and Paul the Apostle, when the former applied the epithet *κρατιστος* to Theophilus, and the latter to Festus. "Most excellent Theophilus," *κρατιστε Θεοφιλε*, Luke i. 3. "Most noble Festus," *κρατιστε Φηστε*, Acts xxvi. 25. We say, in thus expressing themselves, they appear to have acted on the principle of adopting such terms of honour as they found in common use: for the word is twice used on other occasions: once by Claudius Lysias, in addressing Felix; once by Tertullus, in addressing the same person. "Unto the most excellent governor Felix," *τῷ κρατιστῷ ἡγεμονι Φηλικί*, Acts xxiii. 26: "Most noble Felix," *κρατιστε Φηλίε*, Acts xxiv. 3.—St. Luke and St. Paul, then, appear to have proceeded on the very principle which we recommend. They devised no new terms of civility, but they employed that term which they found in common use.

Mr. Gurney refers us to the instances, in which the Evangelist and the Apostle employ the term; but he says nothing of those other two instances, in which it is employed by heathens, in the common parlance of the country. Nor did he perhaps observe the circumstance. It is plain however that without observing it, we cannot see the question in its true light.—With regard to the example of St. Luke and St. Paul, which is sometimes alleged, and we think justly, as a plea for the employment of terms of courtesy, Mr. Gurney attempts to set it aside by urging that *κρατιστος*

"properly denotes neither excellence nor nobility, but an eminent degree of power. The epithet was probably not inapplicable to Theophilus, of whom we know almost nothing, but who from the use of this very word, is supposed by commentators to have been the governor of some province; and certainly it was properly descriptive of Festus, who, as proconsul of Judea was, in that country, possessed of the supreme authority; See *Schleusneri Lex. in voc.*" (P. 319.)

We have accordingly referred to Schleusner. Amongst other examples, he certainly gives us one, where the word is

used to express an eminent degree of power, or perhaps wealth. He also quotes the gloss of Theophylact, "κρατιστος, ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρχόντων καὶ ἡγεμόνων," "κρατιστος, above the civil and military authorities." But in the first place, he gives us an instance, where the word is evidently employed to express *bodily strength*, with reference to the gymnasia, 2 Macc. iv. 12. Bodily strength, indeed, *robur corporis*, as Schleusner reminds us, is the proper meaning of the word *κρατος*; and hence all its figurative meanings are derived. Mr. Gurney fails, therefore, in attempting to explain away the use of the term *κρατιστος*, by showing that Festus was possessed of the supreme *authority* in the country. He must show that both he and Theophilus were men possessed of great bodily strength, or he proves nothing: for in no other sense could the term be "*properly*" applied to them, that being its proper meaning.

We think, however, the reference to Schleusner at the end of the above quotation, is calculated to mislead the reader who has not the opportunity of making it. For what are the words of this writer, with reference to one of the very passages in question? He does indeed refer us to a passage, where *κρατιστος* perhaps, and only perhaps, means most powerful: but he says, "Legitur in N. T. Luc. i, 3. *κρατιστε Θεοφιλε*, optime Theophile. Nam *κρατιστος*, ut Latinum *optimus*, virorum illustrium et nobilium, principum adeo nomen dignitatis erat."—"We read in the New Testament, Luke i. 3, *κρατιστε Θεοφιλε*, best Theophilus. For *κρατιστος*, like the Latin *optimus*, (*best*,) was a term of dignity, of illustrious and noble personages, and accordingly of chief men." All that Schleusner says, then, is that the term was applied to men of authority as a term of dignity; not that it *properly means* power or authority. It was easy to refer us to Schleusner. But if the reader is led from this to suppose, that Schleusner countenances the idea that *κρατιστος properly* denotes an eminent degree of power, he will be much deceived. He rather favours our representation: namely, that *κρατιστος* was the term which St. Luke and St. Paul found in *common use*; and that therefore, without hesitating about its radical meaning, they adopted it.

Yet let us for a moment, suppose that the term in question, does properly denote power. It might then be translated, nor do we know that a stricter rendering will be found, in the words of a poet of our own, "most potent." We ask, then, would Friends agree to this term? Would they thus address chief men? We think not. They probably would

feel as strong an objection to "most potent," as to "most noble," or "most excellent."

Such being some of the objections urged by Friends, against the modes of expression in general use, it may be asked, what is their own system? Stated in all its length and breadth, it would be this: that they will use no derivative which in the sense of its root, and no compound which in the sense of the words composing it, implies any thing that they do not choose to express. They do not merely object to using words in courtesy, which are not strictly applicable in fact, (though their principle includes this :) but, in many of their objections to the English language, they go to the full length of the rule above stated. Take, for instance, the compound, "Madam." They object to this, because it is composed of two words, signifying in the French language, "My Lady." p. 310. Or take the derivative, "January." They object to this, because in the Latin language, it is derived from the name of the false god, or idol, "Janus:" p. 325. (that is, more immediately perhaps, from "janua," a gate, which comes from "Janus.") Thus, neither remoteness of time, nor difference of tongue, constitutes any necessary exception to the rule. No matter what the word now means, nor in what sense it is understood. If any thing exceptionable can be discovered, by diving for its root or component parts, even into the recesses of French and Latin etymology, that is objection sufficient. The principle, it is evident, would bring us back, if faithfully followed out in all its consequences, to the elements of language.

It is almost needless to point out the fallacy on which it rests: namely, on assuming, that whatever once has been, now is, the meaning of a word. "Thus," says Mr. Gurney, commenting on the English names of the months and days, "January is the month of Janus, Thursday is the day of Thor." p. 325.—*Is* the month, and, *is* the day? Say rather, *was*. January, at the very utmost, *was* the month of Janus: Thursday *was* the day of Thor. For to us there are no such divinities as either Janus or Thor. Nor indeed, even if there were, would the inference necessarily follow.

It is worthy of observation, however, that this nicety with regard to terms connected with the names of heathen deities, which is felt by Friends now that the worship of those deities has ceased, does not appear to have been felt by St. Luke, even at the time when it was practised. "We departed in a ship,—whose sign was Castor and Pollux." Acts xxviii. 11. *παράσημψ Διοσκούροις*. Here the Greek word, rendered Castor and Pollux, is *Διοσκούροι*, *Dioscūri*, the sons of Jupiter. Nei-



ther does the evangelist appear to have felt any objection to mention the name of Jupiter, and those of other heathen deities, out of composition. Nay, he does this, as if there really were such deities in existence. Thus he says, "Jupiter, which," or *who* "was before their city," του Διός του οντος προ της πόλεως αυτων, Acts xiv. 13. And in another place, he tells us of "a silversmith, which made silver shrines for Diana," ποιων ναους αργυρους Αρτεμιδος, xix. 24. The sacred writer knew that it would be well understood what his own sentiments were, respecting Jupiter and Diana, and therefore there was no occasion for him to be afraid to employ their names, or words compounded or derived from them. Thus, on another occasion, he speaks of the Arcopagus, or Mars' Hill, επι τον Αρειαν παγον, του Αρειου παγου, xvii. 19, 22; and of Dionysius the Areopagite, ο Αρεοπαγίτης, ver. 34. If, then, one of the sacred writers felt no objection to speak of the Hill of Mars, on what reasonable grounds can Friends possibly object to speaking of the Month of Mars, or March?

And we must say that the system of our Friends does not ensure that extreme correctness, which it is intended to produce. We might make our appeal to the work now before us. How many inaccuracies have we had occasion to notice in it. How little protection from error has been found by the respected Author, in his theory of correct speaking. He evidently writes with an extreme desire to guard himself at all points: and he moves with all the caution of an experienced general, when marching infantry across a plain in the face of cavalry and artillery. He is all formed in squares; and on first taking a view of his position, it looks like the British army at Waterloo. Yet, to lay aside comparison, being quite confident in his cause, and feeling no doubt of bringing the general Church to a sense of its errors, he is not protected, by *his* principle of correct speaking, from constant inaccuracies.

Be it observed, too, that the complimentary phrases, to which he objects, are mere phrases of course: but that he himself employs terms of commendation for a particular purpose; that is, to strengthen his arguments. Thus, he objects, (P. 311.) to the appellation *celeberrimus*, *most celebrated*, (generally written *cel.*), which is so often bestowed by modern Latin critics, as a passing compliment, upon members of their own fraternity; and also to that other complimentary affix, ο πανν, (Pp. 311, 312.) Yet he himself, having to cite, in support of his own opinion, the opinion of a scholar who bears no very high character in the general Church for soundness of principles or of interpretation, calls

him, as we have seen, "one of the most able and impartial of modern biblical critics," (P. 111, note.) And in another place, having to appeal, in defence of his own interpretation of a passage, to the interpretation of Vatablus and Castalio, of whom the former goes for one, and the latter for a fraction, while, if we come to human opinions, both together go for nothing against the general voice of the Church, he tells us of "the authority of two eminent critics," (P. 261.) Mr. Gurney might have exhausted, in the ordinary course of writing, all the complimentary phrases of modern philology, celeberrimus, ἰσχυρὸς, optimus, doctissimus, clarissimus, illustris, nunquam sine laude loquendus, and not have deviated so far from *our* standard, as in employing such expressions, under the circumstances in which he has applied them.

The opinions of Vatablus and Castalio are alleged by Mr. Gurney, with reference to a passage of which mention has already been made: 2 Cor. i. 23. This passage stands in our Bibles, "I call God for a record upon my soul, that to spare you, I came not as yet unto Corinth." The object of Mr. Gurney, as we have seen, is to show that the Apostle, in this passage, cannot properly be regarded as taking an oath. Accordingly, urging that the original expression ἐπὶ τῇ αἰσυχῇ ψυχῇ, rendered, and some will think very properly, "upon my *soul*," refers rather to the Apostle's *mind*, the seat of his intentions, thoughts, and dispositions, he adds,

"The Apostle, therefore, may here be understood, as is observed, on the authority of two eminent critics, in Poole's Synopsis, simply to appeal to the Deity, as the witness of his *condition of mind*—of his real motives and intentions." (P. 261.)

The "two eminent critics" are named by Mr. Gurney in a note: "Vatablus and Castalio." The following are Poole's words. "*Testem Deum invoco* (Est Juramentum perfectum, sed in re gravissima . . . . Huic addit execrationem sive maledictum.) *in animam meam*] i. e. vel, 1. animi mei: vel, 2. in caput meum, sive vitæ meæ periculo; vel, in perniciem animæ meæ, cum maximo meo malo, si fallo. Tale illud jusjurandum, Job." (Josh.) "22. 23. יְהוָה הוּא יִבְרַךְ *Deus vindicet*. Perdet me Deus, si mentior. Sic, *nè vivam*, jurandi formula apud Ciceronem et Martialem; *nè salvus sim*, apud Ciceronem, alibi." It will be asked, What is here said of Vatablus and Castalio? We answer, that the words, *animi mei* (of my mind), have annexed to them a diminutive *z*, thus; *animi mei<sup>z</sup>*: and, on looking for the fellow of this *z* in the margin, we find it standing thus, \* V. Ca.: V., it appears, standing for Vatablus, and Ca. for Castalio. Such, gentle reader, are the grounds on which Mr. Gurney appeals

to Poole's Synopsis, in the terms which we have seen. "The Apostle, therefore, may here be understood, *as is observed, on the authority of two eminent critics, in Poole's Synopsis*, simply to appeal to the Deity as the witness of his *condition of mind*, —of his real motives and intentions." Let us put this into plain English, and it will stand thus.

"*I call God for a witness* (It is a complete oath, but in a most weighty matter . . . . To this he adds an execration or malediction,) *upon my soul.*" ] That is, either 1. of my mind<sup>z</sup>: or, 2. upon my person, <sup>z V. Ca.</sup> or at the peril of my life; or, to the destruction of my soul, the greatest evil that can befall me, if I deceive. Such is that oath, Josh. xxii. 23. *הוּא יִבְקֶשׁ יְהוָה* (Deus vindicet) *let the Lord himself require it.* God destroy me, if I lie. So, *may I not live*, a form of swearing with Cicero and Martial; *may I not be saved*, with Cicero, elsewhere." Poole.

"The Apostle, therefore, may here be understood, as is observed, on the authority of two eminent critics, in Poole's Synopsis, simply to appeal to the Deity as a witness of his condition of mind." Gurney.

We cannot allow that any such observation is made. Poole certainly intimates that the words usually rendered "upon my soul," may be rendered, according to Vatablus and Castalio, "of my mind." But, in telling us this, Poole by no means observes, that the Apostle may here be understood simply to appeal to the Deity, as a witness of his condition of mind. A person reading Mr. Gurney's book, would imagine that some observation of this kind was made by Poole, totidem verbis. But Poole plainly tells us there is a complete oath, "*juramentum perfectum.*" He gives, indeed, "of my mind," as a possible rendering of the words commonly translated "upon my soul," and refers us to Vatablus and Castalio. But he himself evidently takes the passage in the sense of an oath, even on the supposition that this rendering is correct: and the editors of Poole's Annotations, a work intended to present an abstract of the Synopsis, were so far from discovering the *observation* of Poole's which Mr. Gurney alleges, that the following is their account of the Apostle's meaning. "Here is a perfect form of an oath, which is nothing else but a solemn calling of God to witness the truth of what we speak, whether promising or asserting. Those words, *upon my soul* also, have the force of an *imprecation*; but it is in a very serious thing." And though Vatablus is referred to by Poole for the meaning, "of my mind," under the letter z, he is again referred to, under the letter b, for the meaning "to the destruction of my soul."

But, let us look, rather, to general results.—What our Friends call “plainness of speech,” might, perhaps, more properly be characterized, after the title of the work before us, as “religious peculiarity.” That is, it is certainly a “peculiarity,” but whether it deserves to be called a “religious peculiarity,” we have some doubts.—Plainness implies homeliness, and artlessness. But for our own parts, we can but regard the style of communication which our Friends have chosen to adopt, as far-fetched, unnatural, artificial. And not only this. In putting their principle into practice, they sometimes go too far, sometimes, not far enough. Thus, in changing the names of the year from January, February, &c. to first month, second month, &c. it appears to us that they go too far. “Many of the months of the year have received the names by which they are usually described,” as Mr. Gurney tells us, “in honour of false gods;” and they change them *all*. How many have so received their names, is a very doubtful fact. It is certain that the last six have not. Of the first six, March may be said to have been named from Mars, with tolerable certainty; January from Janus, probably; April from a Greek name of Venus, or from one referring to her, and June from Juno, possibly: May from Maia, if she was regarded as a divinity, conditionally; and February from Juno Februata, very improbably. It is observable, however, that several of these names are derived by some, from other terms: as April *ab aperiendo*, May *à majestate*, or *à majoribus*, June *à junioribus*. Of the remaining six, July and August were named from Julius and Augustus Cæsar, (each probably during the life of the person thus distinguished, certainly the former; and therefore not with reference to any supposed apotheosis;) and the other four, *Septem-ber*, *Octo-ber*, *Novem-ber*, *Decem-ber*, upon the very principle of the appellations substituted by the Friends themselves, from the numbers of their respective places in the calendar of Romulus. See *Ainsworth Thesaurus Ling. Lat. Comp. Vol. II. ad calcem, in app. de Mens. Rom.* (For we also can quote from the learned.)

Here then we think they have gone farther than was necessary; but in another instance, not far enough. Mr. Gurney suggests to the young of his community, whether it be not proper, in speaking to a person older than themselves, or otherwise their superior, “to use the family name, in addition to the first name of the person addressed.” page 333, Note. We suggest however, whether upon their own principles, it be not extremely improper. Do not some family names “represent falsehood?” Shall we call a weak and

fallible mortal "Good," "Noble," or "Faithful?" These are all family names: and "there are scarcely any words in language, of which the sense is more obvious, or more plainly fixed." Shall we call a man Young when he is old, or Wise when he is a simpleton? Surely this would be "inconsistent with a simple and unbending veracity."—It is well to talk with heroism of enduring ridicule, for the sake of such fancies; but when we glory in bearing the cross, let us first be quite sure that we bear it for Christ's sake.

We object also, that the mode of communication adopted by Friends, is calculated to lead others into error.

"All that can be urged, (says Mr. Gurney,) on the other side of the question, will probably be found to resolve itself into a single position, viz. *that the falsehoods which these expressions represent are so customary, that they are become inefficacious—that they no longer deceive.*" (P. 323.)

This, however, is by no means the whole of our case, however probable Mr. Gurney may think it. We not only allege that our "falsehoods" do not deceive, but that your plainness of speech does deceive. For instance; we receive a letter, not so addressed as to designate our station in life, not beginning and ending with the usual civilities of appellation and subscription, and not without some singularities in the style of its contents. Now it is very possible that we know the writer. Then indeed the case is altered. His character for kindness and true Christian courtesy interprets his phraseology. But the proper way is, for the phraseology of an epistle to interpret itself;—at least if the use of words be to express the writer's mind. And supposing we judge by that rule, (neither knowing the writer himself, nor any of his brethren of the same community, which would probably come to the same thing,) then we shall very probably *be deceived*. We shall think that he intends harshness, rudeness, defiance, when he intends nothing of the sort.

Let us take only the instance of the personal pronoun, "thou." This Friends are accustomed to use, in addressing a single individual, instead of "you:" gaining, we maintain, no other object by the change, than that of substituting old-fashioned for vernacular English. (Not however that they are strictly grammatical, in modern days, even according to their own principles: for we find them very generally employing, instead of the nominative "thou" the objective "thee," and subjoining a verb in the third person singular, instead of the second.) Now to this use of the pronoun of the second person singular, there is attached a particular idea of brusquerie, or incivility, in more nations

than one. The French call it *tutoyer*, the Italians, *dar del tu*, nor is the phrase, *to thou* a person, unknown in our own language. Are we, then, acquainted with the person who thus addresses us? Are we acquainted with the community to which he belongs? Then all is well. But, if our judgment of the person, and of his disposition towards us, is to be formed from his words, then, we say, there is a false impression—we are deceived—he intends a particular regard to the law of truth, but he conveys to our minds the idea that he despises and intends to slight us, and we are led into an error. This, we say, is deception: while the use of a different form of speech, though less correct according to the grammatical rules of our language which once prevailed, would be truth.

The second topic is “plainness of behaviour.” In connexion with this topic, there are particular actions to which Mr. Gurney objects.

“In presenting ourselves before our fellow-creatures, we believe it right to avoid the *submissive* inflexion of the body and the taking off of the hat, as a token of personal homage.” (P. 327.)

If we rightly understand Mr. Gurney’s italics, his principles, while they forbid the inflexion of *submission*, permit the inflexion of recognition or salutation.

The idea of submission, then, is what is objected to. As he afterwards observes, the actions in question, the bowing down of the body, and the pulling off of the hat, denote

“that the person addressing *submits himself* to the superior dignity and authority of the person addressed.” (P. 328.)

We will go so far as this with Mr. Gurney: that the person addressing himself does, to a certain degree imply that he “*submits himself*” to the person addressed. But we cannot allow that this of necessity implies any “superior dignity and authority” in him. And what difficulty, we would ask, need Christians feel, in *submitting themselves* one to another? Does not the Apostle Paul say, “Submitting yourselves one to another, in the fear of God,” Eph. v. 21.? And does not the Apostle Peter say, “Likewise, ye younger, submit yourselves unto the elder: yea, all of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility,” 1 Pet. v. 5.? Need we then be so much afraid of “submitting ourselves?” And on what principle does Mr. Gurney object to these ordinary courtesies of life, because they *denote* that we submit ourselves? Is this his high code of *Christian* morality? May ours be humbler; and may his some day become so!

If we may be permitted to state our own view upon the

present subject, it is this : that in addition to what we owe one another as matter of right, there is, over and above, something due in courtesy, deference, and respect. We cannot render to all their dues, without rendering "honour to whom honour" is due. And this is a very comprehensive rule of scripture ; for we are required to "honour all men." Our principle is very accurately exemplified in Acts xxviii. 10 : "Who also honoured us with many honours ; and when we departed, they laden us with such things as were necessary." Here it is evident that the honour implies something beyond actual necessities, for these are specified besides.—And though St. Paul, on another occasion, strenuously rejected *divine* honours, it does not appear that he rejected the honour here spoken of. Hence we infer, also, that the honours offered by Cornelius and St. John, and declined by St. Peter and the angel respectively, (Acts x. 25, 26, Rev. xix. 10,) were not such honours as men usually offered to one another in those days ; but were, though not, possibly, meant to be divine honours in either instance, yet of a very particular and extraordinary kind : and therefore that, though *such* were declined, we may still continue to receive and render the ordinary courtesies of life.

It is urged by Mr. Gurney, that some of the "obeisances" used in the intercourse of man and man,

"are the very signs by which Christians are accustomed to denote their allegiance to the *Almighty himself*." (P. 328.)

We cannot see that this is any objection whatever. It is far from clear that no posture or outward action employed in the worship of God, should on any account be employed to honour any human being. In some parts of divine service, it is usual for men to stand to worship. According to this rule, then, a servant ought not to stand before his master, nor a workman before his employer, nor a subject before his king :—to which there is this objection ; that if he sit down, it will seem to imply a distinct disavowal of any intention to serve, to labour, or to obey. So also if we omit to bow, where a bow is usual. This does not merely say, "I do not consider myself inferior to you : " but it says, "I consider you inferior to me." Therefore it comes to this : that the peculiarities of behaviour adopted by our Friends say more than they mean ; and, in the case of substituting obsolete forms of expression for vernacular English, and of abstaining from the usual terms of courtesy, do actually convey a false impression.

Indeed, we might very reasonably urge, that there are certain actions, for the use of which, in the worship of God,

there does not appear to be any real *motive*, except that those actions are already known, as the signs of honour among men. Were that not the case, the employment of them in divine worship would have no meaning. As it is, we use them as tokens of honour before men, and therefore we will not withhold them from God. It was the value of gold as a current metal, that constituted the value of the gold bestowed by Solomon upon the adorning of the temple. Had the metal borne less, or no value, among men, it would have borne less or no value, for the object upon which he bestowed it. We will render, then, to the Lord all that we render to man, besides those more distinguishing honours, of worship, trust, fear, and love, which are peculiarly his own.

But, if we refuse to render to men the outward signs of honour, it is too much to be feared that our temperament will naturally tend to haughtiness; and that the unbending body will bear within it a stern and scornful mind. That this is commonly, or indeed ever the case, in the Society of Friends, we mean not to assert. But we do assert, that there are some symptoms, which warn them that the evil is to be apprehended. We may appeal to Mr. Gurney's own words, which tell us, in terms easily understood, what his own remarks have been.

"In the observations which have now been offered on plainness of speech and behaviour, I have been very far from any intention to disparage so useful and amiable a quality as *courtesy*. On the contrary, experience has thoroughly convinced me of the great practical importance of that quality, as a means of smoothing down the little asperities of society, and of rendering the communications between man and man profitable, easy, and agreeable. Under these impressions, I cannot rightly do otherwise than express my earnest desire, that the junior members of our religious society, may more and more estimate the advantage of polite manners, and study a true civility towards all around them—that they may never so mistake the religious principles professed by Friends, as to imagine that there is any thing to be found in those principles, which justifies a want of refinement, gentleness, and delicate attention, or which can lead us to withhold, from our superiors, that respectful demeanour and that willing service, so evidently their due." (Pp. 332, 333.)

It is then added in a note,

"I venture to take the present opportunity of suggesting to the consideration of my young Friends, whether it be not proper for us when we speak to a person older than ourselves, or otherwise our superior, to use the family name, in addition to the first name of the person addressed. This simple and unexceptionable mark of deference, prevents the appearance of undue familiarity; and let it be remem-



bered, that undue familiarity not only involves a breach of good manners, but is often productive of moral injury. (P. 333.)

When young people are in the habit of addressing their elders in the manner here intimated, the case is indeed beginning to look serious. Our Friends will find it easy to teach the young to be haughty, contentious, opinionated, and self-confident; to presume on their own judgment, and to despise that of others; to hold the universal Church of Christ to be both practically and theoretically in the wrong, and themselves, only, in the right; to think that the religious world has been from the beginning going on in error, and that they alone are capable of bringing it back to primeval purity; to assume a bluntness of deportment and address, and to mistake this for Christian simplicity of speech and behaviour. But they will not find it so easy to teach the young to be humble, gentle, and distrustful of themselves; to view themselves as members of the Christian community, nothing if they stand alone, and depending, for their whole strength and importance, upon their union with the other members and the Head; to render honour to whom honour is due, and to "show out of a good conversation their works with meekness of wisdom;" to avoid indeed the extremes of servility and adulation, but not, because that is necessary, to fail in the plain duties of Christian courtesy and deference.

Respecting the third topic of discussion, "Plainness of apparel," it may hardly be thought necessary to contend. Ornamental clothing, of every kind and degree, seems to be objected to by Mr. Gurney; as ministering to personal vanity, and as demanding too much thought and time. If our Friends, by their mode of dress, find that they really avoid these two evils, and are able to convince us that they may not equally or even more effectually be avoided, by a mode of habiliment not so totally at variance with the times, we shall not object to their taste. We question, however, whether the object is really gained. To say nothing of the graver vanity, of announcing inward dignity by outward simplicity, which more peculiarly belongs to our own sex, we think there may also be female vanity, in the preparation, putting on, and wearing, even of raiment entirely devoid of the modern appendages of flowers, ribbons, and lace. And if there be vanity, then there must of necessity be a corresponding expenditure of thought and time. Indeed, those who are more competent to form an opinion than ourselves, have assured us that, in respect to time at least, this must be the case. Nay, a little embellishment, as it strikes us, may be found useful on this very account—that it may give a seemliness to the apparel, with less of a

daily expenditure of time and attention, in putting it on. The true essence of the controversy, however, as far as regards *peculiarity* of dress, is brought, we think, by Mr. Gurney himself, into a very small space.

"The appearance of form, I might rather say 'uniform,' in the dress of Friends, may be considered as arising in a great degree from two causes: *first*, that the disuse of all the ornamental parts of dress has, in itself, the inevitable effect of making them in their attire *differ* from other people, and *resemble* one another; *secondly*, that Friends have not allowed themselves to change their mode of dress from time to time, in pursuance of the ever-varying *fashions* of the world." (P. 337.)

Every part of this passage, we think, fairly represents the truth, except perhaps the conclusion. Friends, says Mr. Gurney, have not changed with the *fashions*. But the fact is, they have not changed with the costume of their country. Would it not be thought rather a droll plea, if a Blue-coat boy, with his bare head and yellow stockings, were to tell a Westminster boy that he had not changed with the *fashions*? Yet such is Mr. Gurney's notion.

It is undeniable that there is some need of reform in the religious world, with regard to the article of dress. It is the other sex in which the reform is chiefly needed: and in coming to particulars, it is the other sex, we conceive, to which the nature and extent of the reform should in a great measure be referred. For ourselves, we have found it next to impossible to form a correct opinion on the subject. Dresses which we have thought far too showy, we have been assured, by *those who knew better*, were very poor, very common. Others, again, which we have thought quite plain enough, have consisted of costly materials, in the merits of which we were not initiated. And here, by the bye, we would throw out a hint to our Friends: namely, that if our habiliments be ever so plain and singular, yet if we be particularly nice and expensive in the materials, no end may be really gained: at any rate there is still all the luxury of "clothing in fine linen." If we may be permitted to give an opinion, the Wesleyan Methodists, to whom Mr. Gurney refers, come nearest, as a body, to our views of what is right. In them we see a due simplicity, without the abandonment of the English costume.

In the conclusion of the twelfth chapter, and in that of the whole work, what appears to be a favourite idea of Mr. Gurney's, more than once recurs: namely, that the Society of Friends is placed, for a particular object, in the Church of Christ; that it

"is raised up for the purpose of *shewing forth* certain practical

truths, not yet fully embraced by Christians in general;" (p. 348.) "that a peculiar importance attaches to the station maintained in the Church of Christ by the pious among Friends; and for this reason—that they appear to be appointed depositaries of certain plain, practical, Christian truths, which are at present far from being generally received." (Pp. 356, 357.)

For our own parts, we know of no better or higher standard than the true one; of which we believe the general Church of Christ to be the real depository, and from which, we conceive, the religious system of Mr. Gurney is a deviation, in many important particulars. And we hold that those who go beyond this standard, will be found beneath it, as well as those who stop short of it. Mr. Gurney observes, that the religious peculiarities of Friends "will be found in a remarkable manner *adapted to one another*." p. 354. Indeed we think they are. But when he maintains, in the same sentence, that they are "in no degree inconsistent with those fundamentals in religion, which are common to all true Christians," he advances that which he has by no means made apparent in his present production.

If there be any, young or old, who are beginning to hesitate in their adherence to these "religious peculiarities," let them hesitate a little longer. It may be they are nearer the truth, than at any time when they have felt confirmed and settled in the observance of them. For ourselves, we will not say merely that inclosing the work now before us, we continue unshaken in the *leading* principles of our Church: but we will say, we continue unshaken even with respect to the *least* points. As to the general results of the system now recommended to us, in them we see nothing calculated to affect our view of its principles. We see, indeed, much allegation of practical good, in the work now before us: but where the fruits are real, there we conceive they are only such as are shewn forth, without parade, in the practice of all true Christians; such as abhorrence of slavery and the slave-trade, strictness in the payment of debts, and an abstinence from smuggling. The plain truth is this; and in the present work it is very plainly expressed;—that, with respect to the rest of the Christian world, Mr. Gurney regards the Society of Friends as standing not only on different but on higher ground. They uphold a peculiarly high standard of moral duty: they enjoy direct spiritual communications: nay, they are wiser than the apostle Paul and the primitive Church; for they reject a Christian ordinance which he plainly practised, and delivered not only to Jewish, but to Gentile converts. Yet already, we think, do we perceive

tokens of declension; and that, while in other Christian communities, without the same loftiness of pretension, there are very general tokens of improvement. Mr. Gurney himself intimates, (pp. 228, 229,) that the number of ministers has decreased in his community: as well as that, whereas formerly "the work of the ministry devolved much more generally and extensively upon the men, than upon the women," now "on the contrary, the ministry of the women is found rather to preponderate, in the Society, over that of the men." And, as he adds with great truth, "such a circumstance can by no means be deemed a favourable sign." p. 226, 227. Nor are defects and anomalies of this kind merely incidental to the system. They are the natural consequences of those views of the Christian ministry, which forbid any regular provision for its support.—Our Friends, too, must take a far greater share than they have ever yet borne, in the work of *Christian Missions*, before we can be persuaded of the soundness of their system. Yet we fear, that that system is such, as if closely adhered to, will for ever forbid any very direct and extensive participation in the work. And accordingly we observe, in the communications of the exemplary individual of their Society who has lately visited Africa, some expressions, which, as we understand them, more or less directly militate against the principles of pure quakerism; and which she seems to use, in reference to some contest with those principles, which she has had to maintain.\*—Nay, we doubt whether persons, who possess such principles, can hold even correct doctrines correctly. Their view, for instance, of the duty of entire dependence on the Lord alone, seems plausible: but then we are to remember that one element of this duty, according to their system, is an entire

---

\* "I cannot, my dear Friend, conceive, that the continuance of life, in this world, is so much to be desired as to authorize all the fears and apprehensions that have been urged, to prevent any persons from settling here, except from a very clear conviction that it was their duty to make such a sacrifice. We may be like the Israelites, looking for signs, when sufficient evidence had already been imparted." See *Missionary Register*, for September 1824, page 401. "It appears to be the will of the Most High, that his creatures should be made the AGENTS and INSTRUMENTS of improvement to each other." . . . "Let us then seek for nothing more earnestly than entire dedication to his will; and resign ourselves wholly to pursue what we apprehend to be His appointments concerning us, whether it be for life or for death." *Miss. Reg.* for July 1824, page 301.—"To pursue what we apprehend to be His appointments concerning us;" that is, not to wait for signs; and not to refuse to pursue any thing short of a direct voice, or inward impulse, of the Holy Spirit. This is written from a land of spiritual darkness; and the writer feels that what is there to be seen is sign enough, without waiting for any farther call.

rejection of various means of grace, which the Bible teaches us to believe, the Lord has appointed. On such a fabric of doctrine, however specious, no reliance is to be placed. The building may appear fair and well-proportioned, nay, it may be well put together in all its parts; but its foundation is unsound, and therefore in the end it must come down. And so far from our assenting to the idea of any *benefit* to the general Church, as likely to accrue from the peculiar attitude maintained in it by the Society of Friends, we apprehend that much *evil* may be, and is, the consequence: to those for instance who are weak, and unsettled in the common faith; when they see something at variance with the received standard of doctrine and practice, and are so confidently assured that it is something higher and better. At the same time, we might insist on the obstacle to general harmony and uniformity, presented by these "religious peculiarities:" and we apprehend that if any effectual effort were to be made, in the present day, towards that grand and paramount object, which will infallibly be some day accomplished, the restoration of the outward and visible union of all the true followers of Christ of every name, the religious peculiarities of the Society of Friends would be found to present one very serious impediment.

And while we cannot accede to the representations which have been put forth, of the great benefits that are found practically to result from these religious peculiarities, we do not without satisfaction observe, that other systems, which have been depreciated as less scriptural and less spiritual, are not without good fruits, that evince the goodness of the stock from which they spring. An incumbent in our own Church shall be lying under all the alleged objections, as to his office, functions, and maintenance, which the system of our Friends, or which some other systems, impute to him: he may have fallen into the error of thinking that he is a priest at all, or even that there is any such thing; he may have to contend with all the disadvantages which he is necessarily exposed to, from being represented, to his own people, as an intruder and an hireling; he may have no spiritual resources, for ordinary duties, except that ordinary aid, which those who boast a higher system, disown and refuse to act upon; he may be assailed by the annual testimony of a non-acquiescence in his legal claims;—and yet that man, by a patient course of kindness and well-doing, shall go on, through evil report and good report, blessed with all the wishes of his people, and, under God, converting souls to Christ; so that, whenever he

is called away from his labours, their tokens shall remain behind him, and "his works shall follow him."

Quakerism, like some other systems, more or less erroneous, appears to have its foundation in the exclusive selection of a single truth of the Christian religion, which is pushed to extremes to the detriment and even abrogation of others. Thus one class of persons so insist upon the manhood of Christ, as to set aside his divinity. Another class, less known in the present than in a former day, were so entirely intent upon Christ's intermediate character, arising from the union of the two natures, as to deny both, and to set aside both his divinity and his humanity. Another class so insist upon matters of ecclesiastical import, as to make them paramount to matters of spiritual import. Another class so urge Christian liberty, as to sever the bonds of Christian unity. And exactly in the same manner, as it appears to us, another class, even the Society of Friends, adopting a correct principle, namely "that God is a Spirit, and that they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth," carry this principle to an extreme, which is totally unauthorized by the terms in which it is conveyed; and which leads them, in opposition to other principles and finally indeed to this principle itself, beyond all bounds of Scripture and sound doctrine.

We have expressed ourselves very decidedly on the present subject; but not, like some writers of the day, without condescending to give our reasons. If principles, such as we have been discussing, are now gaining ground, we consider this an evil. When they are offered for our acceptance, as in the work before us, with many recommendations of style and composition, the case calls only for a more determined course on our part, and we have therefore freely stated our sentiments. We rejoice that there is a common ground, upon which we can meet our Friends in harmony; but we, also, have our "religious peculiarities."

## V.—BIBLE SOCIETY IN IRELAND.

1. *A full account of the proceedings at a Meeting, held 9th November, 1824, at Carrick-Shannon, in Ireland, as to the propriety of distributing the Scriptures amongst the Population of that Country.* London: Westley. 12mo.
2. *A Report of the Proceedings at the Anniversary of the Carlow Bible Society, held the 18th and 19th of November 1824.* Westley.

OFTEN as Ireland has engaged the attention of the legislature, and presented subjects of anxious inquiry, never, we may safely affirm, did its internal situation more imperatively demand prompt and decisive measures than at present. We have, at the same time, reason to be thankful to Divine Providence, that the circumstances of the empire are, at this moment, peculiarly favourable for bestowing on this disordered spot the necessary attention, for probing its wounds to the bottom, and for applying the proper remedy, as far as that remedy can be discovered. We are at peace, and likely to continue so. We are in a state of growing prosperity. Our numerous population is thriving, contented, and happy. The government is united and strong. The ministry have no opposition whose encounter they need apprehend; nor any rivals with, at least any recognized, pretensions, to their offices. In such a favourable state of things, it will naturally be expected, that the deliberative wisdom and best energies of Parliament should be employed to secure the tranquillity of Ireland. That its tranquillity is more than threatened, that the country is at this moment in a state which portends a fearful convulsion, cannot be denied by any reflecting man. While we take this view of the state of Ireland, we see at the same time, cause of congratulation and rejoicing in the open and unequivocal form which disaffection has assumed. When we see our enemy, we are able to ascertain his powers, and leisurely to prepare our measures and weapons of defence. It will be obvious at once that we allude to the proceedings of the Roman Catholic Association and Priesthood. With respect to the body, calling itself "The Catholic Association," it has been in active operation, under different names, for several years. The same persons who now call themselves "The Association," constituted in former years "The Catholic Committee," and

“The Catholic Board.” If we examine the debates of the present body, we shall find the topics, the arguments, the grievances, the chief speakers, the measures proposed, down to the very measure of taxation, or “Catholic Rent,” as it is called, we shall find all these the same as during the time of the “Committee” and the “Board.” The only difference is that they now avow their designs more plainly, and threaten with more confidence than formerly.

For many years it has been apparent to every careful observer of events in Ireland, that Catholic emancipation is only a pretext with the leaders of that body. The real objects at which they aim are, the subversion of the established religion, and the substitution of their own in its stead, together with such a government in Ireland as shall leave the connection between the countries merely nominal. It is no sufficient objection to the truth of this representation, that the Irish themselves deny it, even though that denial should be avouched by some of the most respectable authorities among them. The truth is, (and England should know it) that honest and honourable as are many of those who give their testimony in this country on Irish affairs, they are among the worst witnesses to whom we can have recourse on such subjects. They are not free agents. That most absurd of all legislative measures, the grant of the elective franchise to Irish Roman Catholics possessed of freeholds of the value of forty shillings annually, has stript the Irish representatives,—and they are among those whose authority is chiefly relied on in Irish affairs,—of their independence. When men must speak and act so as to please the popish priests and popish leaders, their speeches and acts are of little value. Hence it happens, that the more conscientious and honest try to persuade themselves that what they *must* say and do is right; while the less scrupulous go all possible lengths in deception and misrepresentation. Of this some memorable examples were recently given, in Parliament, during certain discussions relative to the Jesuits’ establishments in Ireland. In a word, England will be deluded, if she rely on any authority short of that of the Roman Catholics themselves, as to their real object and designs.

To ascertain these, she need only have recourse to the proceedings of the Catholic Association and Priesthood. The public press reports these proceedings, a very slight examination of which will shew that the real object of these parties is such as cannot be attained without the overthrow of the existing order of things in Ireland. Among many proofs of this, which might be adduced, we select a few, to



which we beg the serious attention of our readers. Let us ask, for what purpose has the Catholic Association been instituted? What object does it propose to itself? On what subjects does it deliberate? Of what description are the speeches delivered in it? The answers to these questions, if extracted from the published reports of that body itself, will be decisive as to the point at issue. The Association, however it may affect to mask its constitution and proceedings, in order to escape the lash of the law, exercises in fact all the functions of a representative body, and it is considered as doing so, by the papists themselves. Let us hear Dr. Doyle, the celebrated popish bishop, on this subject. "You do well," says he in one of his many recent addresses to his brethren, "to identify yourselves with the Catholic Association. They represent every interest and sentiment in our body."\* This representation is re-echoed by the Dublin Evening Post, one of the official journals of the party. "It cannot be denied," it says, "that the Catholics, high and low, regard the Association with unlimited confidence. The number of its members is now considerably above one thousand; and embraces *all* the Catholic peerage, baronetcy, and gentry of Ireland: *all* the archbishops and bishops;—most of the parochial clergy;—most of the Catholic barristers and attorneys; *all* the Catholic merchants, and a great proportion of the Catholic shopkeepers; in short, comprising a representation of the feelings, the opinions, and the claims of the Catholic people of Ireland."†

Again, Dr. Curtis, the Roman Catholic primate of Ireland, says in a letter to this body "The Association possesses the respect and entire confidence of the whole Catholic Body."‡ Hear Mr. O'Connell on the same subject: at a meeting of the Association, held on the 24th of November, he said, "It cannot be asserted that the managers of your affairs are a factious few, who do not represent the wishes or interests of the body at large. The Association now consists of *ALL* the clergy of the country;—*ALL* the nobility, or nearly all;—*ALL* the professional men of the least notoriety or eminence;—and *EVERY* man of weight or respectability in the mercantile world."§ After this authoritative statement, can it be doubted that the Association represents the sentiments of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, containing as it does, among its members and supporters, their

\* Dublin Evening Post, Oct. 23, 1824. † Dublin Evening Post, Oct. 30, 1824.

‡ Dublin Evening Post, Nov. 16, 1824. § Dublin Evening Post, Nov. 25, 1824.

aristocracy, their clergy, their lawyers of all classes, and, in short, almost every individual of their body who has any pretensions to the character of a politician. This is a circumstance which deserves particular notice; because we have been long told by their friends and advocates in this country, that the violent speeches of a few leaders were to be disregarded: and that they spoke not, the sentiments of the body at large. It appears now, however, that they do. Most of the chief men among them, and the clergy, who are the most influential part of them, as a body, are now seen making common cause with the most violent of those, formerly represented as mere noisy harmless demagogues.

But, we repeat it, what object does this Association propose to itself? Is it only to prepare and transmit their petition or petitions to Parliament, the only legitimate object, if they aimed merely at emancipation, and if they sought to obtain it in a constitutional way? No: this is but a small part of their business, and indeed the part to which they pay the least attention. They thrust themselves into every thing connected with the government of the country. They arraign the proceedings of all public bodies; and calumniate, and hold up to public hatred, every individual of every rank, who presumes to differ from them. They are, at this moment, levying on the country large sums of money, to the amount of many thousands of pounds, the ultimate destination of which is a secret which they do not see fit to disclose, but with a part of which, in the mean time, they carry on vexatious law proceedings against those whom they wish to annoy. They controul partly by influence, partly by fears, and partly by bribery, a large portion of the public press of Ireland; and they are avowedly endeavouring to do the same in this country. They have actually appointed a resident agent in this country, with a considerable salary (Mr. Æneas M'Donnell, a barrister,) who has already appeared at different public meetings in London, held by those benevolent societies which take an interest in the welfare of Ireland; and has indecently interrupted their proceedings. But we are not left to guess at the designs of the Association, or to collect them by reasoning or inference. They boldly avow that their object is, not merely emancipation, but a repeal of the Act of Union, a reform in Parliament, and the suppression of the Protestant establishment of Ireland, together with the appropriation of its funds to their own church. For these purposes they openly make common cause with the radical reformers of this country.

Mr. O'Connell, accordingly, in one of his speeches at the Association, said, "that he had the happiness of Mr. Cobbett's acquaintance;—and he thought that a list of his valuable works should be posted up in the rooms of the Association, that the numerous persons attending, may have an opportunity of seeing what eminently useful productions they can supply themselves with from the pen of so admirable a writer."\* In the same spirit, the Hon. Pierce Butler, in the chair of the Association, on the 10th of November, said, "I cannot but think, gentlemen, that Catholic emancipation, however important it may be considered as one of the great measures of national relief, must, nevertheless, be considered quite nugatory as alone competent to restore Irishmen to the benefit of the British Constitution. . . . The sovereign remedy will be found in a complete and effective Parliamentary reform, and in embodying our cause with the Reformers of the sister country. Gentlemen, it is my most fervent wish, that your Association may not be dissolved, until two important measures be carried, —Catholic emancipation, and a repeal of that odious measure the Legislative Union!"† To the same effect is the following extract from a letter from Lord Cloncurry to the Association, read at the same meeting. "If the Catholic Association has no other view than what is called Catholic emancipation, I acknowledge their right; but I feel comparatively little interest in their success. . . . I feel that the emancipation of Ireland depends on *the repeal of the Union*—that measure would at once give us a reformed Parliament; for there could be no idea of restoring the disfranchised and purchased boroughs. The first session of such a Parliament would restore life and peace to the capital and to the country; would annihilate party feeling, would exchange Tithe for a moderate and respectable provision for the clergy of every denomination, according to their services."† At another meeting, held shortly before, Mr. Hugh O'Connor declared, that "Catholic emancipation was not a panacea for every evil; but it was the boon that had been most desired, and, it ought to be first, not last conferred, in order to the pacification of the country." These speeches were received with loud cheers; and ardent and unqualified thanks were voted to Lord Cloncurry, for his letter.

Now, how is it possible, after this, that any one can persist in telling us, that emancipation is the great object of those

\* Dublin Evening Post, Aug. 3, 1824. † Dublin Evening Post, Nov. 11, 1824.

persons, and that it would satisfy them, and give peace to the country. The want of this emancipation is not felt, we venture confidently to affirm, by one hundred individuals out of the numerous population of Ireland; or in other words, there are not one hundred persons who, in consequence of it, would find the slightest alteration in their condition; while the measure would seriously (and in the opinion of some of the wisest, ablest, and best men in both countries, fatally) affect the Protestant constitution, in every part of the empire. Into the merits of the Emancipation question we shall not enter. It would be waste of time to discuss them. The Catholics themselves declare that this measure is not a panacea for the evils which they complain of; that they value it not at the worth of a straw, in comparison of other things; and that if they obtained it to-morrow, they would use it as a means for accomplishing their ulterior purposes, until the accomplishment of which their Association would continue in full operation. Away, then, with the delusion so long and, we regret to add, so successfully practised among us, that the distractions of Ireland are occasioned by the exclusion of the Roman Catholics from Parliament; and that the admission of them would be the commencement of a kind of golden age in that country. The true cause of these distractions we shall now proceed to develop: or rather we shall exhibit to our readers the developement of it by the Roman Catholics themselves.

During the political conflicts which have prevailed in Ireland for the last thirty years, it has been continually urged by the advocates of the Catholic claims, that Popery had undergone an ameliorating change, and that it was no longer the bigoted and intolerant system which it had formerly been. Indeed it is well known, that, effectually to silence the opponents of concession to the Catholics, on the ground of their dangerous tenets, certain queries were submitted, during Mr. Pitt's administration, to the most distinguished Catholic authorities abroad, and that the answers to them were considered as furnishing a triumphant refutation of the charge of intolerant bigotry. In vain was it urged, on the other side, that, whatever opinions Popish authorities abroad might think it expedient to deliver, the doctrines of the Church were fixed and unalterable; and, like the infallibility of their Pope, admitted not of exception or appeal. This was branded as an uncharitable misrepresentation, and as utterly inconsistent with the enlightened spirit of a liberal age. And indeed it must be acknowledged, that the cautious conduct of the Roman

Catholic priesthood in Ireland, seemed to favour the idea of the infusion of a more liberal spirit into their religious system. With the exception of the period of the last Irish rebellion, in 1798, where several of them were instigators and leaders in some of its most atrocious acts, and all of them, with scarcely an exception, guilty of concealing the preparations for it before it broke out, and of consorting with its agents during its progress, with these exceptions, the priests have, for the most part, kept in the back ground, and taken no share, publicly at least, in politics. It has, to be sure, been thought extraordinary, considering their influence with their flocks, and their opportunities, derived from confession and familiar intercourse with them, of knowing their intentions, that they have never given any warning, either to the government, of intended insurrections, nor to the many murdered victims, of the miserable death with which they were threatened. This cold, neutral policy was doubtless very suspicious. But still, such has been the fashionable liberality in both countries, that, overlooking all this, every opportunity has been eagerly embraced for holding up the priests as the promoters of peace and loyalty. A new course of proceeding, however, has been entered on, and that very vigorously, by this body. They have latterly appeared on the stage as politicians; nay more, while they have avowed the same political sentiments as the most violent of the laity, they have thrown off the mask on the subject of religion, and openly proclaimed the most intolerant dogmas of Popery. In this new line of politics, and religious controversy, Dr. Doyle, one of their bishops, has taken the lead. Mr. O'Connell himself has not gone greater lengths in politics than has this militant bishop; and as to his more immediate province, that of religion, he has proceeded so far as to denounce the Established Church as inconsistent with the rights of the Roman Catholics, and as the bane of the peace and prosperity of Ireland. In our last number we quoted largely from one of his publications. We shall, therefore, at present, pass on to some of his brethren. One of them, the Rev. Mr. L'Estrange, at a late meeting of the Association, (where by the way, the priests regularly attend,) used the following expressions, in consequence of a complaint having been made that the priests had not attended the meeting of the Bible Society in Dublin, for the purpose of interrupting it. He "did not conceive," he said, "that they were called upon to enter the lists with every mountebank preacher who might think proper to arraign their doctrines. . . . To be perfectly plain, the Catholic clergy do not recognize any ecclesiastical character as

"properly belonging to the clergy of the Protestant Church. He repeated that a Catholic cannot acknowledge that the very highest dignitary of the Protestant Church is an ecclesiastic, claiming consideration under the sanction of *divine right*." This declaration was received with "loud and repeated cheers." \*

Now this is plain language; and we shall find, as we proceed, that this bold display of the dormant, and, as was supposed, extinct spirit of popery, is part of a new system deliberately formed, and acted on both by clergy and laity. One of the lay members of the Association, (Mr. O'Reilly, if we recollect aright), at a late meeting of that body, refused to sanction the appointment of Mr. Æneas M'Donnell as their agent to this country, because he had suffered his child to be baptized by a Protestant clergyman in compliance with the desires of his wife, who is of that persuasion; on which occasion Mr. O'Reilly spoke in the most contemptuous terms of the Protestant clergy, and of religious rites as administered by them. His sentiments were cheered by many present, although it was not deemed prudent, just then, to act upon them; and accordingly his opposition was overruled. Here it becomes necessary to advert to the circumstances which have given rise to this bold avowal of hatred and hostility to Protestantism on the part of the priests and others. For several years back the disturbances, outrages, and distresses of Ireland have engaged a large share of public attention; and the conviction has become deeper and deeper every day that the cause of these lamentable evils is not to be found in the political circumstances of the country; and consequently that no mere legislative measure could furnish the proper remedy for them. It has become singularly manifest that the true source of the misfortunes of Ireland is to be found in the ignorance, and consequent degradation of the great mass of the people. No other explanation, it appears can be given of the extraordinary fact, that a peasantry remarkable for acuteness, as well as for many kind and generous qualities should, not only, not advance in civilization, in an age of progressive improvement, but absolutely retrograde in all that renders a people prosperous and happy, and, under a free and paternal government, exhibit worse appearances than the lowest orders of the most despotic states of Europe. As this discovery, which it is wonderful was not made at an earlier period, forced itself on the public mind, every power was exerted on the part of the benevolent in both countries

\* Dublin Evening Post, November, 1824.

to make amends for past neglect, and every engine was set at work to provide instruction for the people, and particularly that they might be enabled to read the Holy Scriptures. This anxiety and these efforts to impart useful knowledge were met by a corresponding eagerness on the side of the poor Irish to receive it. Nothing could surpass the avidity of young and old, male and female, to acquire the power of reading. The schools established by individuals and by public bodies were crowded. Evening and Sunday schools were attended by adults, whose employments did not admit of their presence at other times; and in various parts of Ireland, the whole face of the country was covered with schools, and the schools filled with eager learners. The priests, at an early period, shewed a jealousy of these schools, and a disposition to put them down. In some places they succeeded, but in many instances the efforts made to conciliate them, and, above all, the determination of the people to avail themselves of the proffered advantages, overcame their opposition. Great care was taken, in almost every school, not to interfere with the religious prejudices of the people, and to avoid every thing like proselytism; the Bible being the only religious book introduced, to which, it was conceived, the priests could have no reasonable objection. To supply the necessary copies of the Scriptures, the Bible Societies in both countries lent their aid. It soon became obvious that from the working of this system the happiest effects might be anticipated; insomuch that, at length, the Government felt the importance of affording instruction to the Irish people; and accordingly, in various ways, by direct grants from Parliament, and by instituting inquiries into the abuses of long established funds originally given for the purposes of education, it lent its aid to the efforts so happily begun by private individuals. It was not very long, however, before the priests felt that this was striking at the foundation of their usurped dominion over the consciences of the people. An enlightened population would not answer the purposes of an ignorant and bigoted priesthood. They took the alarm; and now, one and all, they have proclaimed open war against schools, \* and Bible Societies, and the perusal of the Holy Scriptures by their flocks: and in this they are joined by the Catholic Association, and other persons of the same stamp throughout the country. If the priests alone had risen in

---

\* While this is passing through the Press, the newspapers inform us, "that the London Hibernian Free School at Bilboa, county Limerick, has been wilfully set on fire, and, with the furniture, Bibles, books, &c., totally consumed."

opposition, it might have been attributed to mere interested motives, or to a narrow-minded bigotry peculiar to their body. But the laity vie with them ; nay, in one instance at least, they have surpassed them in indecent violence. The instance to which we allude deserves particular notice. It occurred at Cork at a meeting of the Ladies' Hibernian School Society. At this meeting, which consisted chiefly of females, Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Shiel, two *enlightened* barristers, and *great* men in the Catholic Association, made their appearance. We trust our readers are deep enough read in the records of Catholic politics to know these two *great* men. Not to know them, would argue ourselves unknown ! At this private meeting of ladies, held on the 9th September at Cork, these two powerful Catholic leaders presented themselves, not as might be supposed, as mere auditors, to learn the nature of the proceedings, but, for the purpose of making an attack ; such an attack as should have the effect of deterring the ladies from holding future meetings, and of course of breaking up their establishment. The following extracts from their speeches will exhibit at once their liberal sentiments, and their gentlemanly consideration for ladies. Mr. Shiel said " That the general perusal of the Bible without any interpretation was in accordance, perhaps, with the desultory " and capricious genius of the Protestant religion : but in " Ireland there exists a creed utterly incompatible with this " wild freedom of opinion, and which is so determinate and " fixed, as to leave no field for the exercise of individual judgment in the construction of the word of God. The Roman " Catholic faith is built on the Scriptures, *as explained by " their Church* ; and if the lower classes were to peruse them " without that explanation upon which their religion rests, " it is not unlikely that they would contract opinions inconsistent with the meaning invariably annexed by Roman " Catholics—by the Church to the holy writings. The whole " dispute narrows itself into a question of fact. Is it (*i. e.* " the circulation of the Scriptures without note or comment,) " or is it not inconsistent with the spirit of Catholicism ? If it " be, there is an end of the argument, at least it must be admitted that Roman Catholics are justified in their strenuous " opposition to an attempt to subvert their religion. The " lower classes of the Protestant community," added the learned gentleman, " are driven into a sort of biblical insanity " by this system of excitation ; and madness, now-a-days, " almost invariably assumes a religious character. Now how " can this be accounted for, but by referring it to the fanaticism which the unrestrained perusal of the Holy writ-



“ings has produced?” Mr. S. concluded his address, by applying to the assembled ladies those words of our Saviour, “Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is made, ye make him tenfold more the child of hell than yourselves.”

We shall now hear Mr. O’Connell—“He would ask, which of the Bible-reading gentlemen agreed in their faith? He did not believe that any two of them he saw held the same religious opinion. Did the young English gentleman and the Scotch captain (alluding to two gentlemen from this country who were present, and who have visited the schools of the London Hibernian Society in various parts of Ireland) who came here as missionaries, hold the same faith? They travelled, he supposed, in a post-chaise, to overturn the Catholic religion. How did these post-chaise companions agree on religious matters? Did they toss up for their religion? Or which of their religious tenets were their converts to embrace? It was too good a joke of the English sending a school boy and a Scotch captain to educate the wild Irish, and bring them over from the religion they had derived from their fathers.—Though a layman, he would undertake to prove to any rational mind, that the Catholic religion was the only form of faith that had all the consistency and evidence of a divine revelation. The Roman Catholic religion was increasing in Scotland; it was increasing rapidly in England; whenever a chapel was opened, thousands flocked to it. In Ireland, it was gaining converts every day, and from all sects. The chapels were found insufficient to accommodate the numbers who attended them; though it was not one cold service that was celebrated in the day, but repeated services from five in the morning till one in the afternoon. Dr. Doyle, and two of those bugbears, the Jesuits, accompanied by the Rev. Dr. Keogh, who has already many converts, would shortly proceed to England. They would preach that pure faith which served as a beacon to light to the haven of salvation—a beacon having the light from the resurrection of our blessed Saviour, and never to wane until his second coming. They would return the compliment which England paid to us, by endeavouring to draw back her inhabitants to the holy faith of the saints.”

Now setting aside the coarseness and insolence of all this, mark the bigotry, the genuine popish spirit, which breathes in it. With what scorn does Mr. Sheil allude to protestants and their religion? And then, as to the poor Catholic laity,

they are stripped of all right and power of judging for themselves ; and, tied and bound as to their mental faculties, they are consigned to the tender mercies of the priest. The Bible is to them a sealed book, which they are not to presume to open ; and their judgment and conscience are to be in the keeping of the Church ; and the reason assigned for this bondage is, that if they were to peruse the Bible, "it is not unlikely that they would contract opinions inconsistent with the meaning invariably annexed to it by the Church." Such is Mr. S's. confession. He fears to trust the people with the Bible, lest it should make them protestants. Mr. O'Connell's nonsense is not worth noticing, except for the purpose of pointing out the wild absurdity of his complaints about making proselytes. He glories in the numbers of proselytes which, he says, popery is making in England and Scotland ; and absolutely avows that a Quixotic mission, consisting of certain Jesuits, together with Dr. Doyle, and other doctors, we care not who, is about to be undertaken to this country, to convert us all to the true faith ! And yet, while he makes this avowal, he pours forth the most violent abuse of the helpless females whom he was addressing, because they were endeavouring to teach a few children to spell and read, as if this was to overturn the popery of the Roman Catholics of Munster. We shall only add, that at the close of this gentlemanly speech, and quite in keeping with it and the whole procedure, he turned to the rabble which attended him, and, to the astonishment and horror of the poor ladies, called on them to give "three cheers for old "Ireland."

A few days after this, another attack, of a much more ferocious kind, was made in Cork upon a Society of a different kind, under circumstances which prove unequivocally that the hostility of the Roman Catholics, lay and clerical, is excited, not by apprehensions of proselytism, or against Protestants as engaged in proselytizing, but against Protestants as such, from a bigoted hatred of their religion, and from a determination, founded on hopes of success, raised by recent occurrences in Ireland, to overawe and put them down by clamour and outrage. On the 21st of September last, a meeting was held of the Cork Auxiliary Church Missionary Society.—The Dean of Cork presided, a dignitary of mild and conciliatory manners, who, some years ago, publicly expressed his disapprobation of Orange processions. After two or three gentlemen had addressed the meeting, an interruption to the proceedings was given by a person, named Dwyer, a Roman Catholic, connected with one of the

newspapers. This was "the signal for the commencement of a scene the most scandalous and abominable" (we quote the account of the newspapers) "that ever presumed to set decency and common policy at defiance—sounds of the most deafening kind were raised—the benches were thrown down—artificial noises of various sorts were made without any clemency for the female visitors, and others who attended upon the interesting occasion. The most abominable denunciations were heard from all quarters. A recruitment to the mob inside broke in from the streets, and the uproar which instantly followed beggars all description. The screams of the ladies—the faintings of several—the bustle made to relieve some from their terrors, and others from their sufferings—the curses, and execrations, and menaces shouted by the mob—the mild but useless exhortations of those of a better description—the vociferations raised against the Chair—against a Dean of the established church—against such a man too—as 'pull him out,' 'kick him out,'—the sound of blows and the clamour of barbarous voices, altogether presented to the astonished senses a Babel of confusion.—Let it not be said that the disturbers were the dregs of the people; the two ringleaders are writers for the press! The gallery was filled with men, most of whom were well dressed, and who had been marshalled together long before the chair was taken, and the chief portion of tumult proceeded from this body. We pledge ourselves to the fact, that a Roman Catholic priest was amongst the noisiest supporters of the rioters. There were others of his fraternity present, who expressed no disapprobation at such proceedings. This infamous riot was only put down at last by the sheriffs and a strong body of constables."

Now what was the cause of this outrage? What was the provocation? What was the object of it? The Missionary Society has nothing to do with Irish politics or Irish religion. Its sole effort in Ireland is, to raise a fund from those disposed to contribute to it, in aid of its missionaries among the Heathen. There is surely nothing in this to give umbrage to the Roman Catholics, either priests or laity. No demand was made on them, nor any interference contemplated in their concerns. The meeting was one of the subscribers to this *foreign* benevolent object, and simply intended to gratify them by a detail of the progress and success of the Institution. Let the people of England judge, from the treatment which this meeting experienced, of the genius of popery in

the present day, of the spirit of the Roman Catholics in Ireland, and of the state of the Protestant religion of their Protestant brethren in that country.

This was not the only Missionary meeting which received interruption. At another assembly of the same kind, in the same county, at which a Protestant nobleman, who is also a clergyman, presided, a Popish priest appeared and obtruded himself in a long speech, in which he reprobated the object and measures of the Institution, and recommended them to abandon their attempts to spread the Protestant faith; assuring them that Popery was the only religion which could be effectually propagated among the heathen. What a pity it is that this reverend gentleman should not have read the recently-published treatise of the Abbè Dubois, who has lately returned from India, where he has spent the greater part of his life as a Popish Missionary, without having made, as he assures us, a single convert. The reasons of this failure, as detailed by this Missionary himself, are such as must operate in the case of every genuine son of the Church of Rome. He preached to the poor heathen, not the gospel of God our Saviour with its joyful annunciations, and in its divine simplicity, but that distorted system of fraud and folly, forged by priestcraft, which passes under its name; and he sought to teach them, not out of the pure word of God, which commends itself to every man's conscience, but by means, better suited to his system, by pictures, and pageantries, and mummeries. This religion which the Abbè Dubois sought in vain to teach the Hindoos, the Irish priest would recommend to the adoption of the Missionary Society.

But we pass on to the attacks on the Bible Society, in which the members of the Church of Rome have betrayed their ancient bigoted and intolerant spirit; and avowed their adherence to the very same principles and rules which characterized them in the dark ages. In adverting to these attacks, we have reason at once to rejoice at the turn the whole affair has taken; and to give our tribute of approbation to the leading members of the Bible Society in Ireland, whose prudence and firmness have defeated what was so manifestly the object of the priests. Their mode of procedure renders it indisputable, that they meant, by exciting clamour and disturbance at their hitherto peaceful assemblies, to bring them into disrepute, and to induce the timid and more quietly disposed to withdraw from and discountenance them. Mr. Æneas M'Donnell, the agent of the Catholic Association in this country, appears to have contemplated something of this kind, in his recent attempt to obtrude himself at the annual

meeting, first, of the Irish Society, and next, of the London Hibernian Society; but he found that an assembly of Englishmen is composed of sterner stuff than he had imagined, and he was repelled and put down, as his assurance deserved. The attempt in Ireland was met in a spirit worthy of the Bible cause, and of those who espouse it. It was met with firmness, and yet with meekness, and both tempered with wisdom. We allude particularly to the meetings of the Bible Society at Carrick on Shannon, and at Carlow, where the most systematic attacks were made. On a former occasion, indeed, the Society was obliged to yield to the numbers and brutal violence of its assailants; and its chairman, no less a personage than the truly excellent Archbishop of Tuam, compelled to retreat from the place of meeting at the risk of his life. This disgraceful scene occurred at Loughrea, at a meeting of the Galway Bible Society, in October last. The Popish mob appeared, on that occasion, armed with bludgeons; and such was the violence of their priests, that the most alarming consequences were apprehended; inso-much that it became necessary suddenly to dissolve the meeting. This was probably considered as rather overshooting the mark; or at least as a premature display of disposition and power, which should be reserved for other times and purposes. Accordingly, more moderation was observed at Carrick, and even at Carlow, violent and alarming as appearances were at the latter place, towards the close of the meeting.

We beg particular attention to the proceedings on those two occasions, of which ample details have been furnished by reporters, with whose accuracy there is the best reason to be satisfied. Indeed, in each case, the reports have been authenticated by the respective speakers on both sides. At these meetings, regular discussions were held on the fundamental principles of "the free perusal of the holy scriptures by the people." The chief speaker on the part of the Roman Catholics, at Carrick, was the Rev. Dr. M'Keon, who holds, it is said, the office of Pope's legate or vicar in Ireland. From him, therefore, we may expect the genuine sentiments of the Church of Rome, as well as the strength of the case on the part of the priests. We subjoin the following extracts from his speech.

"The Catholic Church has the strongest veneration for the sacred scriptures, and ever wished that they should be circulated *with proper restrictions*—with the notes and comments of the Church, and accompanied with the explanation of those who were appointed by the Church to be the scriptural teachers of the people. But considering

that the scriptures of themselves, unless accompanied by such notes and explanations, lead directly to every species of fanaticism and infidelity, which is also the opinion of many eminent Protestants, the Catholic Church oppose their indiscriminate circulation.—The Catholic Church do enjoin that those who take the Scriptures into their hands, shall have such a tincture of learning, as will enable them to read them in one of the learned languages; unless their pastors suppose there can no mischief arise from giving them in their native language.—We say that God has appointed a living, speaking tribunal, which is alone competent to explain or interpret their meaning, and to decide what is right.—St. Paul says, “Obey your pastors, for they have the charge of your souls;” and “obey the Church, for it is the pillar of the truth,” to which the faithful are every where directed to have continual access; and these Scriptures prove incontestably, that a living speaking tribunal has been appointed, to which is to be referred any differences of opinion which may occasionally arise. But we would not prevent any pious individual from reading the Scriptures, who would read them in a right spirit, and for a proper purpose; but if we found a second Voltaire extracting poison from Solomon’s Song; or a second Cromwell torturing the Scripture texts into commandments for the commission of crime, and denouncing the people of the land as Ammonites and Canaanites, who were to be destroyed; or a Huss, or a Wickliffe, who wrested the Scriptures to their own fanatical sentiments—then would we deny them the use of the Bible; from these, and such as these, I would withdraw the Scriptures, because they extract nothing from them but poison, to the destruction of their own souls and those of others.” (Pp. 7—10.)

These extracts present the substance of this gentleman’s address; and they certainly lead to the conclusion, that if the Bible Society never encounters a more formidable opponent, in the way of argument, than this emissary from Rome, it will not have much to apprehend. He sets out by asserting that the church of Rome does not, nor ever did, deny the Bible to the people. But it is truly amusing to observe how quickly and effectually he demolishes his own position. For, 1st, he says, it is to be read with proper restrictions; 2d, with the notes and comments of the Church; 3d, accompanied with the explanations of the appointed teachers: because, unless thus accompanied, it tends to every species of fanaticism and infidelity. Further, it is to be read only by those who can understand it in the learned languages—and not by all of those even thus qualified; for it is not to be read by a Voltaire, or a Cromwell, or a Wickliffe, or a Huss;—from such as them the Bible is to be withdrawn, because they extract nothing but poison from it, to the destruction of their souls. If we make these deductions—that is, if we exclude from access to the scriptures, the infidel, the fanatic, the Reformer, and the Protestant, we leave no

Bible readers but the Roman Catholics; and even they must not presume to touch the sacred volume, unless they understand the learned languages, nor, though thus qualified, without leave from their pastors, nor even with this leave, without notes, comments, and explanations.

That there is "a living, speaking tribunal, in the Church of Rome, which is alone competent to explain the meaning of Scripture, and to decide what is right," is another dogma, to which we invite attention. This tribunal is the Church, otherwise the priests. If the priests are to decide what Scripture says, and what it does not say, and to give forth their oracles as they please, their dominion over the judgment and conscience of the people must be supreme, and they must have the entire regulation of their conduct. Here we might urge, that if the priests possess this power, they are deeply criminal for not having used it to prevent the outrages and murders which have disgraced Ireland for so long time, and especially during the last three years. Was the anniversary of a Bible Society the first suitable occasion for bringing this formidable influence into play? But we pass over all this, and come to a more important point. We ask, who that will attend to this language of the Pope's representative in Ireland, will venture to deny that Popery is at this moment, in the heart of the United Kingdom, just what it was on the Continent, at the darkest age of Papal domination? Its advocates, religious and political, assure us, that it has become enlightened and liberal; and accuse those of illiberality and bigotry who deny this. We have, however, the authority of Dr. M'Keon to bear us out, when we hold up the Popery of the twelfth century as the Popery of the present hour. It is unnecessary to enter further into the discussion at Carrick. The two other priests who took a share in it, re-echoed the sentiments of their principal. They were ably replied to by the Protestant clergymen appointed for this purpose; and at the close, it was felt on all sides, that the Catholic party had suffered a signal defeat.

The discussion at Carlow, though not a regularly arranged one like that at Carrick, assumes a more grave aspect, as manifesting most decidedly the spirit of the Roman Catholic priests and leaders in Ireland, and their determination to put down by their influence, and where that fails, by violence, the various benevolent Institutions established for the improvement of the people. The following are the circumstances attending the meeting. The 18th of November was the day for holding the anniversary meeting of the Carlow Auxiliary Bible Society. The interruptions which the Roman Catholic

priests had recently given to Bible meetings in various parts of the country gave rise to the apprehension that this meeting would not be suffered to pass over quietly. This appeared the more probable as there is a Roman Catholic college in the town, and as the celebrated Dr. Doyle resides in its vicinity. It was known also that several of the priests of the college, as well as those of the town and its vicinity, together with a number of the students had applied for and received tickets of admission to the meeting. Accordingly at the appointed hour, these gentlemen and a large number of the Roman Catholics appeared at the place of meeting, a Presbyterian Chapel in the town. Scarcely had the Chair been taken, when one of the priests, a Mr. Nowlan, rose and inquired whether it was intended to allow any other person to speak upon the business for which the meeting had been called, except the members of the Bible Society; avowing, at the same time, that "he and his brethren did not come for the purpose of entering the lists of controversy. They were nevertheless determined to oppose the meeting." This mode of proceeding was strongly protested against, as well it might, by the Protestant clergymen. A good deal of altercation ensued. At length, however, it was conceded, by the members of the Bible Society, that the priests should be allowed to propose their objections, and that they should be answered; and that, in the mean time, the usual business of the Society should be postponed. Accordingly the following priests proceeded to address the meeting: Mr. M' Sweeney, Mr. Clowry, and Mr. O'Connell, whose speeches, (together with those of the Protestant clergymen who replied to them, viz. the Hon. and Rev. E. Wingfield and the Rev. Robert Daly) lasted until six o'clock in the evening, when the meeting was adjourned to the following day. On that day the discussion was resumed, when Mr. Clowry, again addressed the meeting in a speech longer than his former one, although it had been distinctly agreed to, that no gentleman should speak a second time. He was replied to by the Rev. Messrs. Daly and Pope; and then two other Catholic priests, Mr. Kiushela and Mr. Nowlan, were heard.

We call the attention of the British public to some extracts from the address of Mr. M' Sweeney.

"I can prove the inutility of referring to the Scriptures for the decision of the question in debate. St. Peter has said, that many things therein are difficult of comprehension. It is possible in discussion to give passages any meaning.—The Socinian who denies the divinity of Jesus Christ, stands upon as firm ground as the Trinitarian, who stands up for his doctrine. Johanna Southcote's extravagancies



are as good as the assertions of any other pious devotee, and why? For this simple reason; because as all are supposed to have a right to interpret the Scriptures, one cannot accuse the other for giving a preference to their own opinion, nor can one object to the interpretation given by the other." (P. 4.)

Again.

"What is the origin of their Church? They can easily answer me that question; they have not far to go; they can shew no Church of their's except one of Elizabeth, or Henry, or Luther; they can trace no succession to the Apostles; they can prove no necessary missions; in fact, they have nothing among them really constituting a Church. In order to establish their claim, there should be ordination. This even is not enough, they should have a mission. I would liken those Clergymen to Novatian—they are not in the Church, they have no authority from the Church, they cannot shew the link connecting them in the apostolic succession; they may be missionaries, but they are new missionaries, not deriving from him; they have succeeded to no person; and have, in fact, set up for themselves. Either they have a mission, or they have not. A mission is of a two-fold nature—ordinary, or extraordinary. I have proved that, if they have a mission at all, it cannot be ordinary, their not being able to trace it to an authentic source; and if it be extraordinary, let them prove it as Moses did, by miracles; or, afterwards, as Christ did. Then, and not till then, can we believe them." (P. 7.)

Again.

"Spirits of Edward, Henry the Eighth, not forgetting Elizabeth! ye who provided so handsomely for your Thirty-nine Doctrines, which you took such pains to inculcate, and expended so much treasure to preserve; ye who raised so noble and so costly a building; behold the men whom ye have enriched and endowed turning their backs to the very foundation of that structure that ye raised! *Tithe-payers!* listen to this. I have proved to you that they have no claim to your hard earnings. That sworn attachment, from which they ought to derive their emoluments, has been abandoned. There is not, now, any Established Church. Every man has a right to read the Bible; to expound and interpret; to think as he pleases, and to select that form of faith which may suit his own fancy, even though that faith be different from that which those ministers are sworn to maintain, and paid for maintaining. I would advise them to listen to, and to profit by this lesson from a Catholic priest, whom they well know is no friend to their order. I would say to them, 'fools that ye are, ye are working your own destruction,' your very existence depends on your exertions as missionaries of that Church, which you are so well paid for supporting. If every person has a right to read, and interpret the Scriptures according to his own view, of what use are ye? In the past state of the country, I tell ye, ye have been a burden to the community; and in the present, ye are a nuisance." (P. 8.)

And again.

"You possess no one qualification to teach religion; the confidence

of the scholar is the most necessary quality to ensure the success of the master, and wanting that confidence, as you do, how can you expect to succeed in teaching the people? Think you, the history of that oppression which the poor Irish suffered from your ancestors, is forgotten by her children? Think you, that the descendants of those, who deprived them of their literature, are those qualified to recommend themselves to them as teachers—those who hunted their priests, and burned their books, from whom they will consent to receive religion or education? Think you those circumstances are forgotten by the people? Oh, no, no! Well, well, do they recollect them. Their fathers took care to hand down the bloody memorandum to their children; and you, you are the people who seek to become their teachers. Those very children, the children of those men whom your ancestors robbed and butchered, were taught from infancy to lisp the name of *Sasenach*, and with that word was combined, in their youthful imaginations, every thing that was cruel, bloody, and oppressive; every thing wicked in intention, and base in execution." (Pp. 8, 9.)

We had intended to give extracts from the other speeches; but our limits will not allow it. Nor is it necessary, *Ex uno disce omnes*. Such is the religion and such are the politics which the Roman Catholic priests of Ireland, so long held up as models of loyalty, teach their flock. No wonder, then, that the poor deluded people are incessantly breaking out into revolt and outrage.

At the close of the second day's discussion, the meeting was broken up by the clamour of the priests and their adherents. A great tumult was excited, chiefly by a priest who had taken his station at a distance among the lower orders of the people. The candles which had been lighted when the evening set in, were extinguished, and the barriers which surrounded the platform where the Protestant clergymen were seated, were forced. At length the officer who commands the police in the town intimated to these gentlemen that, from the appearance, within and outside the chapel, he was convinced their lives were in danger, and that he could not answer for their safety unless they immediately retired. But such was the infuriated state of those whom the Popish priests had brought with them, that the Protestant clergymen were obliged to scale a wall, in order to escape their attack.

We have thus laid before the public the present state of Ireland. The language and acts of the Catholic Association on the one hand, and of the Popish priests on the other, have been exposed. These, be it remembered, are the men who come to Parliament, and call for new privileges and enlarged

powers. And we have already seen from their own speeches, that what they now ask, and have long been asking, under the name of "Emancipation;" is only desired by them as a means of obtaining absolute ascendancy. It is in fact the country itself, and its uncontrolled sway, that they want. That man is destitute of common intelligence and discernment, who has not discovered in these recent occurrences, that the question now is, whether Ireland shall contain a Protestant church and a Protestant people, or whether both shall be laid prostrate at the feet of the Roman Catholic priests, and receive their yoke.

---

ART. VI.—*Letters and Papers of the late Rev. Thomas Scott*; never before published: with occasional observations, by John Scott, A. M. Vicar of North Ferriby, and Minister of St. Mary's, Hull. London. Seeley and Son, 1824. Pp. xi. and 515.

THE present mode of compiling the memorials of eminent men differs essentially from ancient practice. Biography was formerly didactic in its character; it is now decidedly dramatic. Instead of working up his materials into a plain continuous narrative, and removing the hero into the clear, cold, and philosophic distance of history, the biographer now brings him forward upon the stage, places him as it were, before the eye of the reader, makes him detail the circumstances of his pilgrimage in his own words, and thus invests him with no trifling portion of that individuality, which was once considered as the exclusive privilege of auto-biography. The table-talk, the letters, the minor productions of an author now furnish out the memorials of his history: and this alteration of plan is certainly attended with some manifest advantages. If there be a judicious selection, and natural arrangement of materials—if the "callida junctura," or connexion of various parts be scrupulously regarded—if the writer be more attached to truth than system, and to impartiality than to panegyric—and if he be one of kindred mind with his subject, as well as of admiration for his excellencies, the work will almost neces-

sarily be characterised by a degree of freshness, originality, and liveliness which can hardly fail to make it agreeable, and to impress it upon the reader's mind with a force peculiarly its own. French literature has been long enriched with works of this kind; often couching subjects of serious and weighty import beneath a light and captivating exterior. Our own more grave and less imaginative style of composition has perhaps occasioned some deficiency in a department of letters, equally delightful and instructive. The *Life of Johnson*, by Boswell,—that of Beattie, by Sir W. Forbes,—of Cowper, by Hayley,—and of the Rev. Thomas Scott, by his son, although they may not combine all the requisites already mentioned, in the extent and harmony that would make them perfect models of this species of writing, and which are rather to be desired than expected, have nevertheless done much, among other similar productions, to remove the reproach of such deficiency from the face of our literature.

These remarks apply in an especial manner to those who, walking “along the cool sequestered vale of life,” and surveying it “through the loop-holes of retreat,” never expected to be called forth from their privacy, or to become a name and a praise in the earth. Before a man has attained that irksome, though envied celebrity, which takes him from himself and the little circle of his amusements, pursuits, and charities, to place him on high for the admiration of the world, his correspondence and familiar intercourse with friends will bear the genuine stamp of truth and nature. When he becomes public property, finds himself an object of common interest, and discovers that his modes of life are narrowly watched, his habits of thought examined, his opinions detailed, his very modes of expression noted down, a necessary caution will be induced. He will feel like one who acts upon the defensive; and discover that he must protect himself from the inroads of a curiosity, or an interest scarcely less troublesome than curiosity, which might otherwise detect him in circumstances injurious to that literary reputation which he has, perhaps, so unexpectedly acquired. The consciousness of being under such a state of surveillance will naturally change the unreserved frankness of all his communications into a measured, formal, calculating style of intercourse: or at least cool down those utterances of thought and sentiment which once sprang

“Warm from the heart, and faithful to its fires.”

In our estimate, therefore, of such characters, we must give the most confidence to the earliest periods of their history, in all cases where it is principally related through the medium

of their own sayings and correspondence. Few men are gifted with minds and principles of which the elements are so happily tempered as to defy the influence of public opinion, and to permit them to remain no less candid, guileless, and unsuspecting of observation, than while they were unknown to fame. Cowper perhaps remained more independent of this restraint, to the end of his chequered life, than any other renowned name of ancient or modern days. Yet even Cowper himself, with all the inimitable naiveté of his character, and all the full outpouring of soul which his letters exhibit, seems in some degree to have felt the universal contagion. In the few lucid moments of his later and darker hour, the love of reputation, the desire of a name, the fear of being undervalued as a man of literature, occasionally escapes from his pen in a degree of which his own lowly mind was doubtless unconscious; but which one who has sympathized with his feelings, studied his character, and estimated his pursuits by a moral standard, can hardly fail to discover. A comparison of the early correspondence preserved by Hayley, and the latest letters in the collection of Dr. Johnson will probably illustrate this remark, to the satisfaction of every discriminating reader.

It was an especial advantage to the excellent author of the letters and papers now before us, that, however he might have purposed to communicate to the world some of the more remarkable providences of his life, in honour of that God whose he was, and whom he served, he seems to have been unconscious that his familiar correspondence would ever be laid considerably at length before the public. His mind, thus free from suspicion, expressed its feelings in the confidence of private intercourse, unfettered by any desire of an elegance or terseness, which his simple integrity would probably have scorned, and which assuredly his habits of thought and composition unfitted him to attain. In the plain unambitious statement deduced by his son, partly from his own account, and partly from his letters, we have a striking portrait of a man, whose energy of mind and character would have made him distinguished in any line of life, whether intellectual or mechanical—of a man who could not long breathe the atmosphere of mediocrity, but who must have mounted above it, and seated himself upon an eminence of his own elevation. That energy, when sanctified by religion, condensed as it were into one point, and directed to one end, placed him in the course of his long and useful labour, among the most distinguished of those devoted men who have personally adorned the doctrine of God their Saviour in all things; and who with unswerving zeal have earnestly

contended for the faith once delivered to the saints. His letters and observations in the present volume are in strict and remarkable harmony with all his other writings, and with the whole recorded tenor of his life.

An eager desire of catering to the public taste in every possible mode, has made the prolific press teem with the lives and opinions of individuals, whose characters bear little other claim to notice or notoriety, than would have been worthily conferred by the chronicle of a newspaper, or the narrative of a sexton. The evil is extended to religious biography in an alarming degree; and our attention is claimed to ponderous volumes regarding persons who, however estimable in their day and generation, would never have been regarded beyond their own immediate neighbourhood, if they had not unadvisedly left behind them some journal of sentiments and providences, which ministered indeed conviction or consolation to their own minds; but which are too uniformly parallel with the common experience of religious men, to be generally interesting. Of these private records the zeal of friends, ill-seconded by any chastised and discriminating judgment, has conceived such an admiration as to produce a persuasion of their public value, which has brought their writers for a moment out of an obscurity from which they probably never wished to emerge, and into which they must infallibly return.

Oh, fond attempt to give a deathless lot  
To names ignoble, born to be forgot!  
In vain, recorded in historic page,  
They court the notice of a future age:  
Those twinkling tiny lustres of the land  
Drop one by one from Fame's neglecting hand;  
Lethæan gulphs receive them as they fall,  
And dark oblivion soon absorbs them all.

It will easily be imagined, that the life of such a man as Mr. Scott can never be classed among the biography of those every-day characters which are moulded in the manufactory of custom, and sent forth like images of clay, of kindred shape and varnish from a pottery. He has fairly won his claim to the public regard and veneration. His strong original turn of mind, his unwearied activity, his entire devotedness to the cause of God, his stern uncompromising probity, his perfect disinterestedness, his laborious industry, his consistent and practical theology, united to give him an influence over the religious world, which hardly any man in the lowliness of his ministerial walk ever attained. His

opinions long unknown, then opposed, despised, ridiculed, and persecuted, by highly speculative professors of religion, won at length their sure though toilsome way, and placed him high among those illustrious men to whom, under God, pure and undefiled religion is so deeply indebted. The life of Mr. Scott, therefore, may be regarded as one of those beacons which from time to time are judiciously and kindly raised, to direct those who are making the voyage of spiritual life; and to enable them to pass along their perilous way between the "meagre Christianity of philosophers who deride as enthusiastic all the peculiarities of our faith," in their zeal to reduce religion to a cold and comfortless series of ethical principles; and that mistaken honour for the gratuitous salvation of the gospel, which offers the most flagrant insult to the character of its author, and permits men to sin that grace may abound. Along this safe and happy path did he invariably direct his readers: and being dead, he yet speaketh to the same effect, in every part of his writings; and especially in that monument of his superior wisdom and piety, "the Commentary on the Bible." This great work, like the vast scheme of redemption which it explains, appeared at first "with little assistance of the learned, and without any patronage of the great; not in the soft obscurities of retirement, and amid the shelter of academic bowers; but, literally, amidst inconvenience and distraction, in sickness and in sorrow." It came home, however, to the business and bosoms of mankind. It faithfully and fearlessly unfolded the word of truth. It aimed in simplicity to enforce the record of mercy, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth; and to make its readers wise unto salvation through faith in Christ Jesus. A mind of no common vigour, an industry at which we are amazed, a patience which no difficulties could subdue, and a fervency of prayer which continually wrestled with heaven for a blessing, were unsparingly bestowed upon it. In this age of religious inquiry therefore, its eventual success could not be problematical. Accordingly, though its author now reads the volume of redemption by a light which emanates from the throne of God, instead of studying it as on earth through a glass darkly, the work itself is fast reaching the hands of all who are seeking the way of life, and can afford to make it their own. It has become *κτῆμα ἐς αἰετ*: and it is impossible to consider its success in the Christian world, without in imagination applying to the writer the high import of that proclamation which the beloved apostle was commanded to record amidst the solitudes

of Patmos : "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth : yea, saith the spirit, that they may rest from their labours, and their works do follow them."

The letters now published form a valuable, if not a necessary supplement to the admirable and instructive life of Mr. Scott, which we owe to the piety, good sense, and chastised affection of his son. They will illustrate that consistency which is the very perfection of character ; and which blends all Christian virtues into one beautiful and harmonious whole : as all the rays of the prismatic spectrum, essentially distinct in colour, are united in every beam of light, without the prevalence of any particular hue. They verify in a remarkable manner the character deducible from a perusal of his life ; and especially the just and moderate summary of excellencies given in the conclusion of the memoir, p. 671—676. They exhibit the reality and the blessedness of his religion ; its power, its excellence, and its perseverance. They serve to make assurance doubly sure ; and to fill up any lines which might have been wanting, or only dimly traced in the memoir, until the portrait has become complete ; and we recognize the undoubted likeness of one of the heavenly family.

Some men never think of religion at all. "Their minds wander to all things under the sun, to all the permanent objects, or vanishing appearances in the creation ; but never fix their thoughts on the supreme reality, never approach like Moses, to see this great sight." Over others, religion, conversant as it is with momentous and eternal verities, exerts only an occasional, feeble, and inefficient influence ; continually halting between two opinions ; never taking a decided part ; never expanding into that grandeur of dimensions which fills the soul, and becomes, not only an active, but an exclusive principle within it ; ruling over all its affections, and expelling every desire inconsistent with the claims of Christian duty, and the glories of Christian prospect. With comparatively few does it assume a character, not only of sincerity, but of intensity : as an impulse of conduct supremely powerful and efficacious. Few men attain to that decisiveness of religious habit formed on the model of the Apostle, "This one thing I do." Among this little flock, however, Mr. Scott must undoubtedly be reckoned. Religion possessed him altogether. The world was every where subdued by it, and reduced to a very low rank indeed in his esteem. God and eternity were every thing : and were we to furnish his motto of action from those Scriptures, which he so truly loved and so well illustrated, no one more befit-



ting the bias of his thoughts, or the rule of his practice could well be found, than the advice of Paul to Timothy, *ἐν τῷ ἰσθίῳ*, or those declarations of his great exemplar, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business? My meat and drink is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work." He was a man of that decisive character, who under any circumstances, "would have consumed as little effort as possible in dubious musings, and abortive resolutions; and thus secured its utmost value and use, by throwing it all into effectual operation," applied to the end which in his opinion seemed to be most important. When the bias of his mind was directed to religion, this decision of character became, like a law of nature, unvarying and resistless. He had no leisure, no inclination for objects of meaner pursuit, which might abstract him from the one thing needful. "From the time he began in earnest to investigate the doctrines of the Bible for himself, he not only admitted them as true, in proportion as he discovered them to be true, but acted upon them, governed his temper and conduct by them, fearlessly professed them before men, and cheerfully suffered whatever reproach or difficulties they might occasion," (Life, p. 589.) This inflexibility of mind was, under divine influence, a great condition of his own excellence; and the cause of that remarkable extent of labour, and that admirable consistency of sentiment, by which he is so highly distinguished; and which made him in the language of scripture, with which his son has emphatically and appropriately closed the record of his life, "steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord; forasmuch as he knew that his labour was not in vain in the Lord."

About 300 pages of the volume under notice consist of a miscellaneous collection of letters, written at various periods, to different individuals of his family, or to friends who judiciously sought the benefit of his wise and powerful mind. The remainder is occupied by a series of questions discussed at clerical meetings, of which he was a member; and by some extracts from an unpublished work, meant to exhibit the true nature of Christianity, doctrinal and practical. The statements contained in this unfinished treatise, are always sound, judicious, and practical; but we know not that any great increase to the author's well-earned reputation, or, (what his excellent representatives more highly value) any considerable addition would have been made to the stores of religious knowledge by its publication. An extract which we propose to make will however serve to prove that it is by no means unworthy of a place in this collection; although,

originally imperfect, it labours under the additional disadvantage of extract and abbreviation.

A few remarks of the Editor, always simple and natural, sometimes perhaps too brief and unsatisfactory, serve to connect or introduce the different parts of this correspondence. Such a selection as the present, obviously excluded any unity of design, or systematic classification. The letters and papers are merely "*disjecta membra*" of a mind almost incessantly occupied and conversant with the word of truth, and the realities of salvation; and which as it poured itself forth in the unreserved familiarity of affectionate intercourse, could not find leisure to weigh or to amend the modes of its expression.

The following extract apparently refers to a man long considered as unrivalled in a walk, of which indeed he might be almost considered the discoverer: but whose conceptions of landscape gardening have in many instances outstepped their professed aim, and made nature look so trim and neat, so quaint and orderly, by removing all the grandeur of her features, and all the ruggedness of her character, and softening down all the harsher lines of her surface, that we are sometimes tempted to turn away from such incessant embellishment, to rest upon the unequivocally artificial adornments of terraces and balustrades, regular parterres, spouting mermaids, leaden tritons, walks of interminable straightness, and all the point-device arrangement of an old English garden. The extract will be interesting, because it exhibits a trait of character by no means uncommon with men of genius; but which its possessor, however high in the scale of intellect, will discover to be a worm at the root of his peace, and to place him in a state of estrangement from the love of his kind for which no superiority of mental endowments may compensate.

"I was yesterday in company with some gentlemen, who were talking of Mr. B. They knew not that I was any relation. I find that my opinion of him is exactly conformable to that of others; they all allow him great merit and abilities, but cannot help deriding his vanity, and blaming his overbearing disposition. . . . . It is an established maxim of his, that he will not be contradicted by any body. You will readily form to yourself an idea how agreeable such a resolution must make him in company, and in his family connexions. He is now about to undertake a piece of work within about three miles of this place; to convert an old house into a new one, and a morass, or something like one, into fine gardens. If they will find money, he will find ingenuity, there is no fear; but he is not used to sell his ingenuity at a low rate. They place B. and nature almost on a level: where she errs, he rectifies; removes mountains, makes rivers and woods, fills up cavities: in short, say but the word, and he changes

the whole scene. His ingenuity in this respect is certainly uncommon: and he at one word tells you for what he will execute his plan; and he always does it well. By this means he has got that great repute, and those affluent circumstances, which he at present enjoys, and is continually increasing. But, as in every thing he is used to give laws, not only to man but to the face of nature; and as all his undertakings have been crowned with the most flattering success; this has planted and nourished in him that vanity and overbearing conduct, which render him far less the object of either love or admiration, than he would otherwise be. But enough. We will just observe that this advantage may be drawn from the consideration of this person's character,—that any person, who, like Mr. B., is ingenious in one thing; should be very careful that he do not shew to all mankind his conscious superiority; which perhaps he cannot avoid feeling, and which, felt alone, may be an useful spur to action. But doubly careful ought he to be, not to suffer the air of superiority to creep into those things in which he has no claim to excel. The former of these is vanity, the latter self-sufficiency. If his abilities introduce him into the company of his superiors, he ought to be careful not to be too familiar, nor to affect equality: if he be treated with distinction, to use that distinction with moderation; and to take too little, rather than too much upon him, in all companies, superior or inferior. In short, the more flattering circumstances are, the stricter hand ought to be kept, and moderation and an affable behaviour to be the more studied: otherwise as much is lost on one hand as is gained on the other, in point of credit—while love is entirely forfeited; for who can love the man that always claims an implicit submission to his asseverations?" (Pp. 17, 18.)

There are few persons, at all conversant with the difficulties of inquirers into religion, who have not felt embarrassment in answering the complaints and doubts so frequently arising from a sincerity of desire to know the way of life; attended with that imperfect vision with which the blind man was at first gifted; while yet he saw "men as trees walking." The advice of Mr. Scott to such a doubter is so full, so clear, so scriptural, and so satisfactory, so remote from that miserable *rationality* in religion, which like a dense winter's fog, chills and blinds at once, that, long as it is, we cannot resist giving it any publicity which the pages of this review may afford.

"The two main things that your sister mentions are these:— I. Others know the time when, and the place where, the Lord spake peace to their souls; but you do not. II. Others have *the witness of the Spirit*; but you do not know any thing of it.

"Now, in our day, there is a vast outcry among the ungodly against enthusiasm, and every thing in diligent religion is branded with that name. Would to God care were taken among ministers and Christians to guard against the thing itself, while they treat with neglect

unjust censures about it!—Believe me, there is a great deal of enthusiastical delusion in this matter: and those things which you are desirous of, and troubled at wanting, are, in *their* sense of them, unscriptural; and give Satan an occasion of deluding some, and distressing others.\* By setting up false evidences of conversion, and overlooking the true ones, many think they are converted, who are only stony-ground hearers; they have these false evidences, and are more confident than conscientious. Others that are humble, and tender in conscience, but paying an undue regard to these false evidences, distress themselves because they want them. Now, though true Christians sometimes have them, yet hypocrites are much more likely to have them; they being such as Satan can counterfeit, and doth counterfeit to deceive and lull asleep persons under some convictions, but not converted:—as, for example, words brought to the mind, wondrous sights to the imagination, pleasing feelings in the soul.

“Now, though, in some cases, persons may know the time and the place, both when they were awakened, and when they were comforted; yea, when they were brought to submit to God’s righteousness in their condemnation, notwithstanding all their endeavours, and to cast themselves on his free mercy through the blood of Jesus, and to see his whole character and conduct lovely, and Christ precious, and his salvation glorious, and holiness beautiful, and his service perfect freedom: yet it is not generally thus. At first, knowledge is usually scanty, experiences are indistinct, and views of divine things are confused, and mixed with inconsistency. *Then shall ye know, if ye follow on to know the Lord: his going forth is prepared as the morning.* Now in the morning the day dawns, a glimmering beam diffuses itself; but it is dusk still, and objects are indistinctly perceived: but gradually it grows lighter. Thus it commonly is with true Christians.—In time they find that these effects are produced, and if they are *certainly* produced, it matters not whether we know when or where. If God hath shewn you the strictness and goodness of the law, and your obligations as his creature to love and obey him according to it, so as to convince you that, by nature and practice, you are an inexcusable sinner, deserving of his wrath; that none of your doings can make him your debtor, or give you any claim upon his justice, or make it unjust in him to condemn you: if you see your best deeds to be sinful, and to need forgiveness; and, seeing this, take the blame to yourself, cast yourself on free mercy, as a justly condemned sinner; see a suitableness in God’s way of saving sinners, through the infinitely valuable obedience and atonement of Emmanuel, honouring the law, and satisfying justice in our stead, that he *might be just, and the justifier* of the ungodly: if you have thus learned to see God’s whole character lovely,—that one so great and glorious, so holy and just, should be so compassionate, merciful, and loving: if in this way, you have learned to hate sin, to love holiness, and follow after it, and to be humbled, ashamed, and grieved that you are no more holy; to feel a spirit of cordial love to God’s character, government, and gospel, gratitude to him for his mercies, zeal for his glory; wanting others to

know, love, serve, and enjoy his favour; considering his cause as yours; being grieved when his name is dishonoured, and rejoicing in the prosperity of religion; praying from your heart the beginning of the Lord's prayer:—if this has taught you to desire to be patient in trouble, to be contented in your station, to depend on his providence, to adorn his gospel, and live to his glory; you then have the substantial evidences of conversion, such as they who have the most of the others have in general little of. This filial spirit toward God is *the spirit of adoption, the seal of the Spirit*, which the devil can neither break nor counterfeit; the *earnest of the spirit*, a part of heaven brought down into the soul as a pledge of the whole. And, when the Holy Ghost brings these implanted graces into lively vigorous exercise, then *He witnesses with our spirits that we are God's children*; and not by any words brought to the mind, as many are deluded to believe. The latter, Satan can counterfeit, and it has nothing divine in it: the former is divine, from God, and leading to God.

“Finally, keep close to the Bible, and to the throne of grace, and bring all doctrines to that standard, and never prize or trust to, or grieve in the want of, what is unscriptural.—If what I write be of any use to you, I shall be glad to hear from you, and will endeavour to satisfy your mind in any other difficulty. You are also at liberty to communicate the contents to any other, if you think they may do good. Let nothing discourage you. If you are not sure that you have experienced what I have mentioned, only go on in the use of means: *An open door is set before you, and no man can shut it.* There is love enough in Christ's heart, merit enough in his blood, power enough in his arm, knowledge and wisdom enough treasured up in him, to supply all the wants of the poorest, guiltiest, most polluted, most foolish, and weakest of sinners. *Of his fullness have all we received*: and, *Let him that is athirst come; and whosoever will, let him come and take of the water of life freely.*” (Pp. 58—62.)

If there be any quality by which Mr. Scott's writings may especially be characterised, and which is impressed upon them, as their leading and distinguishing feature, it is surely their practical aspect and tendency. They lay the foundation of religion deep and broad, in the doctrine of justification by the imputed righteousness of Jesus Christ. They regard it however *as a foundation*; and upon it they proceed to erect a building of personal, vital, universal holiness, such as consists with the grandeur of the motives whence it has its rise, and honours the stupendous scheme of mercy which the economy of redemption exhibits to the heart of man. The abuse of that free salvation which he delighted to proclaim, found in him an implacable, and an unwearied enemy. He allowed it no truce, he made no compromise with it: but detected it in all its forms, followed it through all its windings, and exposed it beneath all its disguises and subterfuges. Whether it were found

among the latitudinarian practices of men whose doctrinal views were apparently kindred to his own; or among those who, profess to identify religion with moral philosophy, and to whom Christ crucified is a stumbling stone, and a rock of offence;—he invariably attacked it with weapons drawn from the armoury of divine truth, and which, like the spear of Ithuriel, exhibited its deformity, and obliged it to flee from the contest. To this state of warfare between the ultras on either side, his biographer has alluded, and especially to the stern impartiality with which he attacks this most awful heresy, in whatever quarter of the field it may appear. He has been represented as giving an unwilling, but compulsory testimony to the prevalence of antinomianism among those who are called professors of evangelical religion. He did so: because he observed its necessity in too many instances; because he was too honest to disguise the fact; and because he felt it a duty to protest against that tremendous abuse of the gospel mercy which turned the grace of God into lasciviousness. There never lived a writer less free from the prepossessions of party—not one, of whom it might be more truly said, “*Amicus Socrates, amicus Plato, sed magis amica veritas.*” If Achan was found in the tents of Israel, if the accursed thing were indeed in the camp, and the judgment of heaven to be dreaded as a visitation upon its guilt, no one could doubt the duty of raising a voice against it; though many would shrink from standing in the breach, and exposing the mischief, with his fearless disregard of misconception or obloquy. He has done this work as became one who, with sincere devotion had

——— laid his hand upon the ark  
Of God's magnificent and awful cause.

and every man who prefers the truth as it is in Jesus, before the contemptible cravings, and narrow interests of a party will be eager to do him honour for the justice of his opinions, and the intrepid magnanimity of their expression. The following letter, in addition to those of the same tenor in his “*life*” will place this subject of antinomianism in its proper view; and detect it, where perhaps its existence is little apprehended.

“Dear Sir,  
..... “I was very much pleased with the contents of your letter, and with your way of stating the meaning of the *terms* to which I had objected. Many of these expressions would be harmless enough, if men were more simple, teachable, and upright: but the heart is *deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked*; and Satan is continually employing *all the deceivableness of unrighteousness*, in order to impose

upon men with the semblance of truth. He is ever aiming to mix poison with our food; and, according to the prevailing sentiments of the more religious sort of persons, he accommodates his devices, making some *damnable heresy* palatable and unsuspected, by grafting it on, or infusing it into, the doctrine that most currently passes with apparently serious people: just as an artful destroyer of vermin mixes his poison with the very food of which they are severally most fond. Such plans of deception, such methods of keeping men asleep in sin, as succeed to the uttermost where the precious truths of the gospel are not known, are of little avail where those truths are generally known, and considered as essential to true religion. But shall the enemy, then, here give up his designs, and make no further attempt to deceive? Has he nothing in the human heart congenial to devices of another kind? If men can no longer be lulled asleep in carnal security, either without any religion, or by superstition, forms of worship, or pharisaical self-righteousness; does he give it up as a lost case? By no means. He has many ways of effecting his work of deception yet remaining. But, alas! numbers, both of teachers and writers, seem *ignorant of his devices*. As a friend of mine expresses it, 'They barricado the front door, and keep guard there incessantly, but leave the back doors and windows unguarded and unclosed?' They have discovered that the human heart is prone to self-righteous pride, but seem not aware that it is equally prone to the love of sinful pleasures and worldly objects; and that the Pharisee and the Antinomian lodge more peaceably in the same dwelling, than we are apt to suppose.—The grand object of aversion to the carnal heart in the gospel is, the honour put upon the strict and holy law of God by the obedience and death of Christ; which shews the evil of sin so fully and unanswerably, that it proclaims the strictest moralist and formalist so deserving of condemnation, that he must have perished if Christ had not thus obeyed and died; and must still perish, unless, renouncing all other confidences, he avail himself of this provision, in the same manner with those very immoral wretches whom he so proudly disdains: nay that, if the vilest of these believes in Christ, he will certainly be saved, while the most amiable and respectable unbeliever will perish deservedly and without mercy. This forms the grand objection of the carnal mind to the gospel: but, when an unrenowned heart is driven by argument, and unanswerable scripture testimonies, from the ground of direct opposition, it immediately lies open to Satan's attempts to substitute a form of knowledge, a dead faith, false affections, and a presumptuous hope, instead of its former confidence, *The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be*: and its enmity to the purity and spirituality of the precept is as strong, as its cumity to the indiscriminate sentence of final condemnation which it denounces. Nor can this enmity be reconciled: it must be crucified and destroyed. When, therefore, terror and conviction drive a man to disavow his former self-justifying pleas, and to allow that mercy alone can save him; his enmity to God and his law will make him seek deliverance from its commanding authority, as well as from its condemning sentence: and in this way,

as well as in many others, *Satan is transformed into an angel of light, and his ministers into ministers of righteousness*: and, alas! many good men endorse bad bills.—Direct avowed antinomianism is too scandalous to be general: barefaced rascals do comparatively little mischief in the common state of society: but, by carrying certain parts of religion to an extreme, as if men could not use too strong words in stating and extolling them, or be disproportionately zealous for them; other parts, of equal importance, are run down or kept out of sight. In this way a most subtle, pernicious, and disgraceful bias to *practical*, and in some sense to *doctrinal*, antinomianism has become very general, by means of unscriptural terms, and methods of stating the doctrines of the gospel.—The head may be the principal part of a man; but it is not the whole man. The doctrine of justification is not the whole of Christianity; nor being justified the whole of salvation.—This disproportionate way of teaching only balances parties, and rules by thus balancing them: whereas the scripture attacks equally all the corruptions of the carnal heart, and gives no quarter to any of them.” (Pp. 208—211.)

Among the many temptations by which the ministers of religion are assailed, may be reckoned that of desire to change the situation into which the hand of Providence seemed to have conducted them; where their labours have not been unsuccessful, and where (could they realize the beautiful harmony which God invariably preserves between his instruments and their employment,) they have been most wisely and advantageously situated. It is impossible here to enter into the long and unsatisfactory reasons with which men allow themselves to be deceived, and to quit their post and encampment, to wander forth into the wilderness, before the pillar of cloud and of fire has stirred from the tabernacle to guide their march in safety, and to end it in a blessing. The desire of an enlarged sphere of usefulness is one of the most common and most delusive suggestions, even to devoted and zealous ministers—another is the pleaded necessity of providing for a family; and uniting ministerial zeal with prudential regard to temporal considerations. The following letter applies to the latter case; and forcibly exhibits those views of simple dependence upon Providence in the way of duty, which the writer so conscientiously exemplified:

“My Dear Sir,

“I shall be ready to give you my counsel on the question which you propose, and the case which you state: and I pray God to teach me what counsel to give; for, as I am of opinion that many, whom I ought to consider as more competent judges than myself, will counsel differently, I feel the greater hesitation.

“However, as far as I can judge from your statements, I should not find myself at liberty to advise your friend to accept an offered chaplaincy; much less to apply for one. At forty-five years old, men’s



habits, &c. are fixed; and that versatility, and readiness at accommodating themselves to new scenes, places, and employments, which at an earlier period would not have been difficult, are very rarely seen at so advanced an age; while no small part of the probable term of allotted years would be past, before an entrance could well be made on new scenes of service.

"I even still more object to what you state, as the leading, and almost exclusive *motive*. I am the more disposed to this, because I always resisted, as a *temptation*, the suggestion of such a motive: and, though my family was not so large as your friend's, yet my income for years was wholly insufficient for its maintenance. Unexpected helps alone kept me from being overwhelmed with debt; nor had I, till long after I came to this place, any thing for my family, or even sufficient, without my furniture, to meet my debts. A most unexpected interposition of Christian friends, many of them unknown, has set me at ease, personally: but I have very little to leave to my many grandchildren; whose parents in general are nearly, though not quite, in the same situation as to their families as I was. *God hath fed me all my life long*. I die, but God can provide for my children, and children's children, without me; I cannot without him. I have not since I came here, allowing for my house, cleared £100. a year: yet the Lord hath provided; and I live in plenty, and can give something: and, if more money were good for me, he would give it. But I never went a step out of my way in order to make provision, &c. Now I must think your friend would go out of the way, in quitting his present line and prospects, where he has doubtless obtained a measure of influence and good will by his labours, to go into India, where probably he would not soon acquire the same. Any thing that should come in his own line, unsolicited, or not eagerly solicited, I should not object to: but I own that to go to India, in hopes of providing for his family, seems to me a *carnal* step: and I shall exceedingly wonder, if even in this respect, should he proceed, his aim and expectation do not end in disappointment." (Pp. 295, 296.)

There is an inconvenience attached to the acknowledged increase of religion throughout the land, which has begun already to be felt in a considerable degree; and which threatens to become still more prevalent. It happens too frequently, that a young man no sooner becomes "earnest to flee from the wrath to come, and lay hold on eternal life," than he desires to enter the ministry; without regard to his mental endowments, habits of thought, opportunities of acquiring knowledge, or to those gifts which must be expected in a public teacher of the word of God. Such persons, it is true, give, in most instances, unequivocal pledges of their sincerity and zeal by this desire of change: but assuredly it is not always a zeal according to knowledge. We would not apply the invidious remark, "*Optat ephippia bos piger*," but we cannot avoid observing, that this desire to teach, the moment

a man has begun to learn something of the unsearchable riches of Christ, is often with difficulty reconciled to that humility which the gospel inculcates ; and by which men are taught to exemplify religion in their respective stations, rather than to forsake their appointed post, and to enter, unbidden and without encouragement, into the ministerial office. In the same proportion that this indiscriminate desire of entering the Church in after life prevails, must we look forward to a diminution of that learning in the priesthood which has hitherto been a glory and a defence of the Church of England ; and which, while it formed one of the bulwarks of her own safety, has silently but powerfully contributed to raise the intellectual and educational standard among all the various denominations of sectaries by which she is surrounded. The following remarks of Mr. Scott, on this very important subject, well deserve general attention : and we are desirous of inserting them, from a persuasion that this inconvenience, as was once asserted of the influence of the crown, " has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished."

#### ON CHOOSING THE MINISTERIAL OFFICE.

" It must be admitted that it is allowable, nay a duty, for believers sometimes to change that station in which they were first brought to the knowledge of God : for otherwise it would be still more rare than it is, for men to enter on the work of the ministry with suitable motives and intentions. Yet assuredly this is a step which ought not to be taken lightly ; and which is often taken from very wrong motives, in a very wrong manner, and with very bad consequences.

" Persons newly converted have generally very warm and flashy affections, which have more of heat than light in them ; and, possessing little humility, experience, and judgment, they are apt, in this season of well-meant, but often misguided zeal, to think their former employments in life almost too trivial to be worth minding : and, having acquired a degree of facility in speaking of divine things, accompanied with a love to the souls of men, and a desire of their salvation, they are very apt to think themselves immediately called to, and qualified for the work of the ministry ; and, overlooking all other ways of glorifying God, serving Christ, and doing good to men, nothing will do but they must leave their former stations, and presently commence preachers : presuming to judge of their own gifts, and their own call, and all from their own feelings. As if to guard against this very evil, St. Paul says, *Not a novice ; lest, being lifted up with pride, he fall into the condemnation of the devil.* For this vehemency springs in a great measure from spiritual pride, and leads to greater pride : till this pride, fed by popularity at first, issues in some sad fall : or till, popularity failing, the affections flagging, and discouragements taking place, the premature preacher becomes unfit for glorifying God either in a ministerial or a private station.

" This, I suppose, may be laid down as a general rule, that a new

convert, if not previously employed in this work, ought not hastily to leave his former station to engage in it: for this is expressly to contradict the apostle's rule. Some time ought to intervene, to mature his judgment, enlarge his views, increase his knowledge and experience. Much prayer, meditation, and self-examination as to the leading motives which influence him in this matter, ought certainly to precede. The advice of aged and experienced Christians and ministers ought to be taken, and much deference paid to it. The question of ability for the work should be submitted to the judgment of others than the person himself, qualified and authorized thus to judge: and a clear opening in the providence of God ought to be waited for. —Were these plain rules attended to, while some would be brought forward, humble, judicious, able, and determined ministers of Christ, many, I am persuaded, would on due deliberation judge it their duty to glorify God in a private station; and a wide-spreading scandal, yea, numerous scandals, would be prevented.

“Previously to a sinner's conversion, he and all circumstances belonging to him, his natural capacity and acquired abilities, his distinguishing disposition, whether more bold or more timid, or however varied, is perfectly known to the Lord. When he is called by divine grace, and a proper direction is given to these preparatory endowments, the great Head of the church furnishes him with that measure of knowledge, utterance, and other gifts which he pleases. And in all this he has respect to the post which he has assigned him —whether his present station or some other. He knows best for which the person is fitted and designed: and therefore until, in the ways which have been mentioned, he gives intimation of his pleasure that a change should take place, it is the new convert's duty to go on in his present work, however sanguine he may be, and however earnest in his desires to enter upon a new sphere of action. And *he that believeth will not make haste*: he will wait for God, and not run before him.

“This is a delicate subject: but the observation I have made of the bad effects of mistaken notions in this matter, influences me tremblingly to venture my judgment in the case; though probably it may give undesigned offence.—Generally, I am convinced, it is a believer's duty to *abide in the same calling wherein he was called*, (provided it be a lawful one,) and to endeavour to glorify God therein.” (Pp. 458—461.)

The following instance of point and sententiousness must close our quotations.

“When I think of such men as Mr. Huntingdon, I often am ready to compare them to Sampson, whose ingenuity was employed in catching foxes, and tying firebrands to them, to burn up the crops: but Sampson used this stratagem against Philistines, they among Israelites.” (P. 129.)

“I am not very anxious about consistency: I apprehend that in this world we see truth by compartments, as it were, and are as incompetent to take in the whole of what is revealed at one view, so as

fully to perceive its symmetry and proportions, as an insect is to view the various parts of a building at once, and to decide on the architecture. . . . I know not how it is, but the older I grow the more I love the Bible, and the less I relish speculations or distinctions that do not evidently spring from the scriptures, or help me to understand them better, or to feel more of their influence in my heart." (P. 135.)

"If some lay an undue stress on these things, and put their own strictness in the place of Christ's righteousness, probably they would have vastly less success in propagating their errors, if others did not lay too little stress upon them: as if it mattered little how a man boarded and spent his money, how he gratified his pride or luxury, provided he were not a cheat or a drunkard, said he had faith, and learned to talk of experience." (P. 481.)

Of the volume before us little more need be said. We regard as one of the improving signs of the times, that the doctrines which it every where inculcates, are daily becoming more popular; and that the cause of truth is thus apparently bursting through and dissipating the shades of error. We can desire little better for that sacred cause, than a continued and increasing attention to words of truth and soberness, such as those which we now recommend to the readers of the *British Review*. They who look for elegance of style, luxuriance of imagination, brilliancy of genius, felicity of illustration, or eloquence of expression, will be undoubtedly disappointed. They, however, who admired the author in his son's valuable memoirs, and in his own writings; and who are contented with an honest avowal, a comprehensive statement, and an affectionate enforcement of scriptural truth, will not rise ungratified, or, by the divine blessing, unimproved, from the perusal of a volume admirably calculated to advance "that eternal life, which consists in knowing the true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent."

---

An article which has lately appeared, upon the *Life of Scott and the Memoirs of Newton*, compels us to join our voice to the general complaint of unfairness and misrepresentation, which has long been raised against the *Quarterly Review*.

The article in question, as appears from its opening paragraph, is intended for an attack upon what it chuses to term, the "Evangelical" part of the Church of England. We feel no hesitation in saying at once, that, with respect to

the true state of the questions, now at issue within the pale of the Church, this article betrays a total ignorance, while it advances charges, which are not merely false, but absurd.

"The *Essene* and the *Evangelical*," says the Reviewer, "appeal to their natural feelings as to a divine sanction."—They concur, he adds with the Pharisee and the Papist, "in diverting religion from influencing men's conduct in the business of life." P. 26. Hence, the Christian, convinced that certain states of mind are the workings of the Holy Spirit, "believes his soul to be in immediate communion with God so long as he experiences them, and will not need the evidence of good works, when he feels so clear an internal witness." P. 48. Allegations such as these we might answer with a monosyllable : and many persons would think it the best way of meeting them.

The article in question advances a charge, of confounding the extraordinary and ordinary operations of the Holy Spirit ; and of imputing that to supernatural influence, which may be referred to very early education, to the discipline of circumstances, to the power of strong belief to realize the thing believed, to affections and desires debarred from worldly objects, and to similar causes. An attempt is made to support the attack, by quotations, either from the works of which the article in question professes to be a review, or from John Bunyan, or from a French Quietist : which quotations no more fasten the imputations upon any part of the clergy, or Church of England, than they prove that two and two are equal to five ; and, in fact, afford so little countenance to the charges alleged, that we can view them in no other character than that of naked untruth.

Still the accusations are urged with no small confidence. The Reviewer promises that he will "*prove*;" he talks of what he *has* "proved." He even ventures to appeal, to the "whole course of his *argument*." We fear not to assert that the word "argument" has nowhere any right to a place, throughout the whole course of the article. And we say it with regret ; for we do indeed wish that he had made any thing like an attempt at argument. The utmost we can desire of such opponents is, that they will for once take up a regular position, and stand to be attacked.

The review, moreover, alleges certain *mischievous effects* of the opinions which it impugns. This part of the charge, however, the premises remaining unproved, it is not worth our while even to contradict.

The true doctrine of spiritual influence, as held by the

Church of England, and by the general Church of Christ, we have endeavoured to state in another article of our present number; from the whole tenor of which article it may be plainly seen, how totally the sentiments of the evangelical part of our Church, which we have there attempted to exhibit, are at variance with those which the Quarterly Review imputes to them. We have there observed, that the operations of the Holy Spirit are not perceptible in themselves, but only in their effects; with this proviso, however; that among these perceptible effects of the Holy Spirit, are his inward effects, which appear in the dispositions of the heart. And the man who denies this, we can regard in no other light than as denying Christianity. And as, in the article referred to, we have had occasion to urge, in opposition to Mr. Gurney, that all which is perceptible of the inward operations of the Holy Spirit, consists in the effects and tokens of those operations, not in the operations themselves; so, on the contrary, we have now to contend in opposition to the theology, or rather the no-theology, of the Quarterly Review, against the error of denying that there are any inward effects whatever. For it is obvious, that the *tendency* of the article which we are considering, though the writer of it appears to be by no means clear in his own views, is to deny that there are *any* inward effects of the Spirit's influence. His style, indeed, is embarrassed with some qualifying expressions, which appear intended as admissions of the doctrine, which his matter denies. But truth cannot lie hid. And towards the end of the article in question, the truth, in the present instance, starts out and escapes, as if by accident. "We shall be told, perhaps," says the Reviewer, "that it is AMONG THE BELIEVERS IN DIVINE IMPULSES, that we shall find some of the most zealous and devoted followers of Christ." To judge, then, of the opinions of those who have put forth the review which we are considering, we will take their own words. They clearly are *not* "among the believers in divine impulses." Is not this evident? And if so, on what footing can we meet them, except on the footing of unbelievers? In vain will they attempt to cloak themselves under a disguise, as opponents of "evangelical" opinions. We holdly tell them that, in their true character, they are opponents of religion.—And we must add, that their conduct is as schismatical, as their opinions are heterodox. For the plain tendency of the course which they are pursuing, with respect to the "evangelical" world, is to perpetuate, and to widen, a much to be lamented division, *within* the Church.

Of attempts, like the present, to exclude the doctrine of

spiritual influence, and also that of a particular Providence, let us mark the consequences. "Let it not be supposed," says the Reviewer, "that we would reduce religion to a mere practical matter, in which the heart and the imagination are not to enter." So we are to be condemned for maintaining that a particular Providence, and the influences of the Spirit, enter into the Christian faith, and this is what is to enter, according to our opponents:—the IMAGINATION !!! Then with it, we say, will enter a portentous train of attendant evils: enthusiasm, fanaticism, superstition, schism, heresy, mysticism, idolatry. Once suffer imagination to enter into our religion, and we have no security that any of these, its frequent attendants, will be excluded. Religion, of all things, is that with which imagination should have nothing to do. Let the heart, indeed, with all its feelings and affections,—let the understanding, with all its powers, enter into our religion;—but let imagination be silent and prostrate, before the light and voice of truth. Imagination lies at the root of all the strange theories, novel interpretations, fanciful experiments, with which religion has been disgraced. It will be known, henceforth, what we are to expect from such guardians of the national faith. "Let it not be supposed that we would reduce religion to a mere practical matter, in which the heart and the IMAGINATION are not to enter!" Away with the "Evangelicals." Give us an imaginative religion. We will sing our hymns to Apollo, or adore the relics of the martyrs!

We have seen what are the sentiments of the article before us, and its execution is worthy of them. In an extract from Newton's Memoirs, by Himself, in which he is speaking of early lessons, received from his mother, we have the following words. "Though in process of time I sinned away all the advantages of these early impressions, yet they were for a great while a restraint upon me; they returned again and again, and it was very long before I could wholly shake them off: and when the Lord at length opened my eyes, I found a great benefit from the recollection of them." To the extract from which this passage is taken, the Reviewer appends the following remark.

"Mr. Newton intimates that his heart was not reached by these lessons, that he had consequently sinned away all the advantages which he derived from them, and that they were of no use to him, till *after* the special interpositions in his favour, which subsequently changed his heart,"

What can be more groundless, than this closing allegation? Mr. Newton intimates that these lessons "were of no use to him, till *after* the special interpositions in his favour,

which subsequently changed his heart," says the Reviewer.— "Though in process of time I sinned away all the advantages of these early impressions, *yet they were for a great while a restraint upon me ; they returned again and again, and it was very long before I could wholly shake them off,* says Mr. Newton himself. And what is equally observable, he says in the preceding sentence, "I think, for the encouragement of pious parents to go on in the good way, of doing their part faithfully to form their children's minds, I may properly propose myself as an instance." Then he adds, "Though in process of time I sinned away all the advantages of these early impressions, yet they were for a great while a restraint upon me," &c. So far is he from any intimation, that these advantages were of *no use* to him, till *after* the special interpositions in his favour. But all is fair, in dealing with an "evangelical!"

Not many pages further on, we find the following passage ; which, one would almost think, could only have been written on the supposition that it would be read by no one that understood Greek ; unless indeed we suppose that to have been the case with the writer himself.

"Unwilling to submit to the uncertainty of chance, they (sailors,) ascribe the innumerable incidents, whose dependence on a proximate natural cause they are unable to trace, to a predetermined plan, called fate, fixed from the birth of each individual in spite of whatever nature or man can oppose. We say not that this is a very philosophical arrangement of 'mortal consequences,' but that it is a common one, and has the warrant of antiquity: *αἰτία γὰρ δοκοῦσιν εἶναι φύσις καὶ ἀνάγκη καὶ τύχη ἐπὶ δὲ τοὺς καὶ πάν το δι' ἀνθρώπου.*—*Aristot. Ethic. 3. 3.*"

Who would not expect, from this mode of bringing in Aristotle, that the quotation from his ethics contained the same sentiments as those here imputed to sea-faring men, of which it is cited as a "warrant"? But the fact is, it contains *opposite* sentiments. Yes, reader ; mark and compare. The sea-faring men ascribe incidents

"to a predetermined plan, called fate, fixed from the birth of each individual *in spite of whatever nature or man can oppose.*"

The "warrant" for such sentiments, afforded by antiquity, is this :

"*Nature, and necessity, and fortune, appear to be causes : and moreover, intellect, and every thing that operates through the instrumentality of man.*"

A heathen sentiment, truly ; but widely different from that, of which it is cited as the "warrant : " namely, that fate is fixed "in spite of whatever nature or man can oppose." Aristotle again expresses himself clearly upon this subject,



towards the close of the same chapter. Εἰς δὲ, καθάπερ εἴρηται, ἄνθρωπος εἶναι ἀρχὴ τῶν πράξεων. "Man, then, as was said before, appears to be the principle" (or originator) "of actions." So remote from the Aristotelian philosophy is the doctrine of a fate, "fixed from the birth of each individual in spite of whatever nature or man can oppose." We urge not these points as of any great importance in themselves; but merely as serving to expose the literary *charlatanerie* of thus dragging in Aristotle, when it was only to be done by imputing to him sentiments, at variance, not merely with the very words adduced from him, but, with his general views.

We have observed of late, however, one constant feature in the writings of such assailants; a feature so constant, that we always expect to find it: namely, the misquotation of scripture. One example of this practice we find in the present instance. And though the error lies only in a single word, it is a most important one.

"The wretch, (says the Reviewer,) who is, because he believes himself, in the state of debasement we have described, cannot contemplate the possibility of the gradual progress in religious faith and practice, which is the course of a Christian race and the terms of his warfare, nor that God will *work with him* both to will and to do, but expects a total change of his nature to precede every exertion of his own."

The greater part of our readers need not be reminded, that the text of Scripture here referred to, Phil. ii. 13, runs thus: "It is God which *worketh in you*," (ὁ ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν,) "both to will and to do," &c. Nor is there any philological subterfuge by which this reading of the passage can be evaded. (We have looked into the "Improved Version," so that upon this point our Reviewer may make himself easy.)

The text, then, stands, in the Epistle to the Philippians, thus: "It is God which *worketh in you* both to will and to do." But our Reviewer gives it us thus: "Nor that God will *work with him* both to will and to do:" altering *in* to *with*. And this, we say, is not a slight, but a most important alteration. It is an alteration which begs the whole question; namely, whether there be, or be not, any inward influence of the Holy Spirit. We allege that there is such an influence. If the text be, "It is God which *worketh with you*," no such doctrine appears in it. But if it be, "It is God which *worketh in you*," we need look no further for a proof of our position. That proof, however, was to be suppressed, though scripture suffered.

The present attempt, then, we can regard in no other point of view than as an attack without a breach. It serves at

once, therefore, to prove our strength, and the audacity of our assailants. Nor is the failure less, in what appears to be one specific object of the attack. The "Life of the Rev. Thomas Scott" is taken in hand to be reviewed, but not a flaw can be shewn in it. With one cruel, but now, happily, ineffectual thrust, respecting the death of a beloved child, the memory of Mr. Scott is dismissed. And, towards the close of the article, we have something like a compliment, for the "truly Christian sentiments" of that departed minister and father of our Church; by way of amends, it should seem, for correction that has not been administered. Thus the insect in the fable, having tried about the pineapple on all sides to find an opening, discovers at length that it has spent its time and strength in vain, and goes buzzing off. It is indeed very observable, how the Reviewer, in attempting to fasten an accusation upon the evangelical part of the Church of England, passes off from Newton and Scott to Bunyan, from Bunyan to Madame de la Mothe-Guyon, and, with one slight digression to Olney, from Madame de la Mothe-Guyon to Southey's Life of Wesley—a work, by the way, with which some of the Reviewers of the Quarterly seem particularly well acquainted. However, we scorn to take an unfair advantage of any set of men. The writer, whose review we have been considering, is plainly ignorant of his subject. And as it is probable that the more judicious among the opponents of "evangelical" principles, would disown many of his sentiments and arguments, we wish it to be understood that we do not regard his failure, as a triumph, on our part, over the whole body.

We had intended to have noticed an article which appeared in the same number of the Quarterly, containing a most illiberal attack on Mr. Biddulph's late work on Divine Influence, in which the Reviewer has manifested the same bitter hostility. But the Rev. Author has rendered our interference unnecessary, by publishing an answer himself.

Before parting with the Quarterly Review on the present occasion, we venture to offer one suggestion: namely, that the theological department of a work, maintaining such a position in the political and literary world, ought to be conducted upon some fixed principle. As matters stand, there is no telling what the theological principles of the work, in any given number, are, nor what we are next to expect from it. With regard to the questions between the Church of Christ and unbelievers, the writers of this periodical sometimes express themselves—not altogether unsoundly; sometimes give us what Unitarians reprint and circulate with

instability and so much emptiness, that we are like the marksmen whom we have sometimes seen employed, upon the sea shore, in firing at a floating tub.

When we have to deal with such antagonists, we always suspect unsoundness in some part; and therefore make it a rule to begin by examining and trying about, as a surgeon examines a broken limb to discover the fracture, with a tolerable assurance of finding. We seldom have to search long. Only let our readers remember the principle, on which too many proceed—"Every thing is fair, in dealing with the saints."









